



3 1761 04241 8822

44/6

THE NOTE-LINE
IN THE
HEBREW SCRIPTURES



THE NOTE-LINE
IN THE
HEBREW SCRIPTURES

COMMONLY CALLED

PĀSĒQ, OR PĒSĪQ

BY

JAMES KENNEDY, D.D.

ACTING-LIBRARIAN IN NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH

177073.
22.12.22.

EDINBURGH
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1903

PRINTED BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON : SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.

NEW YORK : CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN.

BS
118.5
K4
cop. 2

PREFACE.



THE following treatise is the result of a special inquiry subsidiary to more extensive research into the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament. While examining passages presenting difficulties in the shape of peculiar words, or forms hard to explain, the writer observed that 'Pāsēq' was frequently associated with these phenomena. The coincidences were so numerous as to suggest the question whether the association was intentional, or merely accidental. Careful examination led to the conclusion that the line must have been purposely placed beside these remarkable readings in the Massoretic text. The important clue thus found proved a valuable guide in further investigation. But at every step the field widened, and it then became necessary to form new categories under which different occurrences of 'Pāsēq' could fitly be placed. In this way, a survey has been made of the entire Hebrew Scriptures. The conclusions are now placed before students of the Old Testament as a contribution towards a better understanding of certain phenomena presented in the Massoretic text.

Among recent writers who have already treated of this sign may be mentioned Julius Olshausen (in his *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache*, § 43), William Wickes (*Treatise on the Accentuation of the Prose Books of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1887, chap. xiv.), E. von Ortenberg (in an essay on 'Paseq und Legarmeh' in Stade's *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1877, p. 301 ff., and in a Programm published in 1887, *Ueber die Bedeutung des Paseq für die Quellenscheidung in den Büchern des Alten Testaments*), F. E. König (in his colossal *Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, part i. p. 122, part ii. p. 358; and in special papers contributed to the *Zeitschrift für kirchl. Wissenschaft* for 1889, pp. 225 ff. and 281 ff.), Felix Perles (*Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments*, München, 1895, p. 30), and F. Prätorius (in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 1899, p. 684). None of these writers, however, take quite the same view of the subject as is presented in the following pages.

The Author's warmest thanks are due to the Publishers for their uniform courtesy in giving effect to his suggestions throughout the preparation of this treatise.

CONTENTS.



I. INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
1. General account of the sign	1
2. Origin and object of the note-line	4
3. Number of insertions in one verse	7
4. Early origin of the note-line	10
5. Relation of the line to later signs and marks	12
(1) The Qerî and the Kethîb	12
(2) The Sebîrîn	13
(3) The vowel-signs	14
(4) The accents	15
Partial summary of results	18
6. High antiquity of the note-line	19
7. Proper place for its insertion : rules	22
The double note-line	28

II. CLASSIFICATION OF CASES.

8. Conditions under which the line may be inserted—	
(1) With unusual Divine names	34
(2) Between the same letter repeated in different but adjacent words	37
(3) When the same letter is not repeated, though expected	38
(4) Between two words identical in form	39
(5) Between adjacent words, similar in form	41
(6) With conflate readings	43
(7) Between similar expressions which are adjacent	43

	PAGE
(8) With superfluities, which may be considered variously	44
<i>A.</i> As regards their <i>form</i> , superfluities may consist of—	
(<i>a</i>) Single letters	44
(<i>b</i>) Single words	45
(<i>c</i>) Two or more words	46
<i>B.</i> Considered in their <i>origin and character</i> , superfluities may be—	
(<i>a</i>) Inadvertent repetitions	48
(<i>b</i>) Intentional insertions: these comprise—	
1. Explanatory additions to the text	49
2. Synonymous expressions	50
3. Pleonasm	50
4. Conflate readings	51
5. Sudden transitions to a new subject	53
(9) Omissions, which may consist of—	
(<i>a</i>) Single letters	54
(<i>b</i>) Single words	55
(<i>c</i>) Two or more words	57
(10) Peculiar forms of words: these may be—	
(<i>a</i>) Noteworthy forms of proper names, or foreign names	58
(<i>b</i>) Rare appellatives	59
(<i>c</i>) Unusual grammatical forms	60
(<i>d</i>) Common words with unusual meanings	60
(<i>e</i>) Words of doubtful meaning	61
(<i>f</i>) Unique forms [<i>ἄπαξ λεγόμενα</i>]	62
(11) Abnormal constructions in grammar	64
(<i>a</i>) Irregularities in the use of the Article	64
(<i>α</i>) Abnormal <i>absence</i> of the Article	64
(<i>β</i>) Abnormal <i>presence</i> of the Article	65
(<i>b</i>) Unusual constructions of nouns	66
(<i>c</i>) Abnormal arrangement of attributives	68
(<i>d</i>) Omission of the relative sign	68
(<i>e</i>) Want of agreement between subject and predicate	68
(<i>f</i>) Noteworthy constructions of verbs	68
(<i>g</i>) Unusual forms or uses of conjunctions	70
(<i>h</i>) Change of construction	71

CONTENTS

ix

	PAGE
(12) Remarkable order of words—	
(a) Words placed in unusual positions, for emphasis	72
(b) Inadvertent displacements of words	73
(13) Startling statements, thus noted as questionable	75
(14) Anthropopathic expressions	77
(15) Suspected readings	78
(16) Unsolved difficulties	90

III. RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION.

9. The note-line frequently marks the position of textual difficulties.	98
10. Inexplicable insertions, however, sometimes appear.	102
11. Want of uniformity in the insertion of the line	104
(1) Different manuscripts and printed editions vary	105
(2) Parallel passages vary	106
(3) Usage varies as to the repetition of the line	106
(4) Striking absence of the line, when it might be expected	110
(a) Unmarked irregularities may be of recent origin	110
(b) The mood of the scribe varied	112

APPENDIX.

List of Scripture passages in which the line appears	117
INDEX	127

THE NOTE-LINE IN BIBLICAL HEBREW COMMONLY CALLED PĀSĒQ, OR PESÎQ.



I.

INTRODUCTION.

I. GENERAL ACCOUNT OF THE SIGN.

THE sign currently known by the name of Pāsēq,⁽¹⁾ or Pesîq, is a perpendicular line,⁽²⁾ occasionally⁽³⁾ inserted between two words⁽⁴⁾ in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. There may be two or more points, in the same verse, at which the mark is found⁽⁵⁾.

1. The term פָּסֵק signifies 'separating' or 'separator,' and פְּסִיק means 'separated.' Both are inappropriate designations applied by later Jews * in

* The root פסק does not appear in the Scriptures, but belongs to post-biblical Hebrew.

ignorance of the origin and true function of the sign, which, though placed between words, was not always intended to mark a separation.* To correct at once the current but false conceptions regarding the use of the sign, it may for the present suffice to direct attention to 2 Kings 18¹⁴, where the line appears after three consecutive words, which certainly present no special necessity for being separated from the word preceding; and to Josh. 8³³, in which the line appears four times, with no distinctively separative force.†

2. The *length* of the line varies in accordance with the taste of the scribe or editor. In some printed editions, its length equals the height of the consonants, as seen in אֶמֶר יְהוָה | בָּה, while in other editions it is short and inconspicuous: thus אֶמֶר יְהוָה | בָּה.

3. On the whole, the sign is not quite common. In an ordinary Hebrew Bible, it may be found only once or twice in some chapters, and not at all in others. Thus, Gen. 1 (see vv.^{5, 10, 21, 27, 29, 30}) exhibits it more frequently than any other chapter in the same book; in chap. 2, it appears thrice (vv.^{5, 21, 22}); in chap. 3, it occurs four times (vv.^{14, 15, 22} *twice*); in chaps. 4, 5, it does not occur at all; in chap. 7, it appears four times (vv.^{2, 21, 23} *twice*); in chap. 8, it is once found (v.²⁰); in chaps. 9, 10, it does not appear; in chap. 11, it is found once (v.⁴); and so on. A

* See p. 38. The form עָקַד (passive participle) is specially objectionable; see Baer's *Hebrew Text of Genesis*, p. 91, footnote. As to the rare conditions under which the line might legitimately be regarded as a separator, see p. 38, footnote.

† It will afterwards be shown that the distinction usually drawn between 'Pāsēq' and 'Legarmeh' rests on no real difference: see p. 17.

full list of the Scripture passages in which it occurs will be given later.* The apparent reasons for its insertion will be fully considered afterwards.†

Considerable variety obtains between one manuscript and another, and between different printed editions of the Hebrew Bible, regarding the insertion of the note-line. Thus, in Ps. 1¹, some copies exhibit it after the first שׁ, while it is absent from others; in v.², similarly, it sometimes appears after בִּי, but is wanting in other editions; in Ps. 100³ it is sometimes found after שׁ, but in other copies it is absent. The probable reason for such variations will be more fully discussed hereafter.‡

4. The *position* of the line, as well as its length, distinguishes it from other perpendicular lines used in the Hebrew text. (a) 'Sillûq' is a short perpendicular line placed *under* a consonant and after the vowel in the *last* tone-syllable of every verse in the Hebrew Bible: thus, Gen. 1¹ הָאֵרֶץ, v.² הַיָּם, v.³ אֵרֶץ. § (b) 'Metheg,' like Sillûq, is a short line placed under a consonant and after a vowel, but this in *any* word within a verse, and there for the purpose of keeping open a *secondary* syllable which might otherwise be regarded as closed by a following sheva, as in הַכְּמָה Zech. 9².

5. In Josh. 1, the line appears twice in v.¹¹, and twice in v.¹⁵; in 8³³ it actually occurs four times.

(a) The sign is found *twice* in the following verses: — Gen. 3²², Ex. 34⁶, Lev. 10^{6, 9}, Deut. 8¹⁵

* See Appendix, p. 117.

† See p. 34 ff.

‡ See p. 105 ff.

§ See Kautzsch's edition of Gesenius' *Grammar*, § 15, 3; *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, p. 22, footnote.

16¹⁶, Josh. 1¹⁵ 19⁵¹, 1 Sam. 4¹⁸ 14⁴⁷, 1 Kings 20²⁵, 2 Kings 7¹, Isa. 6² 11¹¹ 21² 22¹³ 24³ 37⁴ 65¹³, Jer. 21⁷ 38⁴, Ezek. 3²⁷ 9² 33²⁵ 34⁸ 35¹² 38⁸ 39¹⁷ 41¹⁶ 42¹³, Ps. 5⁵ 10¹³ 18^{1. 7. 50} 19⁵ 32⁴ 44²⁴ 66⁷ 73²⁸ 74² 89^{9. 50} 104³⁵ 106⁴⁸ 127¹ 131¹ 137⁷ 144¹, Prov. 30¹⁵, Job 1¹⁷ 11⁶ 16⁹ 20²⁰ 27¹³ 32⁶ 37¹² 42⁸, Esth. 1⁶, Dan. 9^{18. 19}, Neh. 8⁷ 13¹⁵, 1 Chron. 20¹ 21¹², 2 Chron. 4⁴ 19¹⁰ 35²¹ etc. See list in the Appendix, p. 117 ff.

Regarding the 'double note-line' (in Num. 32³³, Ps. 27¹ 84⁴, Jer. 29³² 44²⁶, Ezek. 33¹¹ etc.), see later remarks.*

(b) Passages in which the note-line occurs *thrice* within the same verse are the following:—Gen. 18¹⁵, Ex. 20⁴ = Deut. 5⁸, Josh. 19⁵¹, 1 Sam. 17²⁵ 18¹⁰, 1 Kings 12³², 2 Kings 18¹⁴, Isa. 66²⁰, Ezek. 48²¹, Ps. 10¹⁴ 84⁴ 141⁴, Prov. 30⁴, Ezra 6⁹. In some of these instances, two adjacent pointers may really prove to be a 'double note-line,'* as in 2 Kings 18¹⁴, enclosing 'to Lachish.'

(c) The line appears *four times* in Josh. 8³³, 1 Chron. 27¹.

Additional remarks will afterwards be made on the repeated insertion of the note-line in one and the same verse.†

2. ORIGIN AND OBJECT OF THE NOTE-LINE.

This sign was introduced long ago by observant and scrupulously careful scribes, who sought to conserve the text of the Hebrew Scriptures as correctly as possible. By the simple and primitive expedient of inserting this per-

* P. 28.

† P. 8.

pendicular line, *they desired to call attention to a noteworthy reading*, and especially sought thereby to *assure the reader that the text as transmitted to him was what actually lay before them in the earlier manuscript from which they copied*—even though this reading might appear strange, or might justly be suspected as due to a slip previously committed in the course of transcription, and thus requiring correction.

Abundant illustrations will afterwards be given,* but for the present it may suffice to present the following specimens as types of different categories:—Gen. 22¹¹, where the repetition of the same word (אֲבִרָהָם | אֲבִרָהָם) is certified; Deut. 5⁴, where concurrence of similar forms (פָּנִים | פָּפָנִים) is marked; Ex. 23¹⁷, where the form of the Divine name (הָאֱלֹהִים | הָאֱלֹהִים) is noted as unusual; Ex. 32¹, where an abnormal construction (זֶה | מִשְׁחָה) occurs; Judg. 1⁷, where a questionable reading is noted (שִׁבְעִים | מְלָכִים) ‘seventy kings,’ an astonishingly large number, for which we should rather read ‘seven kings’; 1 Sam. 25³⁴, where a superfluous word (כִּי) is marked; Ps. 33¹², where the omission of the relative (אֲשֶׁר) is noted.

It may now be obvious that the line was mainly intended to serve the general purpose of a *nota bene* addressed to the eye of the reader. The word or words with which it was placed might really form the genuine reading, though peculiar; or they might be of questionable authority; or

* See p. 34 ff.

they might even be unintelligible, and thus require correction. But in no way whatsoever did these reverent Hebrew scribes give any expression of their opinion beyond the fact that they deemed the reading remarkable.* Just as we are now accustomed to insert [*sic*] at a point in a quotation which, with this mark, we prefer accurately to reproduce, and do not venture to correct, though we are convinced that an error exists,—so did these early transcribers simply transmit the very reading which they found in the copy before them, though they had a strong suspicion that it was faulty. Actual criticism and correction of the text, accordingly, did not begin with the insertion of this line; but its introduction formed an important and valuable preparation for later work by the Massoretes, or mediæval editors of the present Hebrew text.† This simple and primitive sign, however, may now be utilised as a valuable guide in the search for a better Hebrew text than we now possess.‡

Such being the original design and use of this sign, the misleading designation ‘Pāsēq,’ applied by later scribes who were ignorant of its origin and purpose, should be discarded in favour of another that is more appropriate and correct. To fix on a neat and fitting substitute is somewhat difficult; but if the mark were re-named the ‘pointer - line,’ or the ‘note - line,’ or even simply the

* Contrast the course followed, later, by the Massoretes in suggesting what they deemed the correct reading (see p. 12).

† See subsequent remarks at p. 11 ff.

‡ For illustrations, see pp. 9 ff., 78 ff., 98 ff.

‘pointer,’ we should obtain a more correct idea regarding its true character and functions. Accordingly one or another of these more appropriate names will preferentially be used hereafter in this short treatise.

Obs.—The rarity or complete absence of the sign may sometimes * be regarded as indicating a comparatively pure text. Thus, in Ps. 31, containing 24 verses, the line appears six times; in Ps. 32, consisting of 11 verses, it occurs four times; in Ps. 33, with 22 verses, once; and in Ps. 34, consisting of 23 verses, it is not found at all; in Ps. 35, which has 28 verses, it appears five times. Ps. 83, with 19 verses, is free from the mark; in Ps. 119, containing 176 verses, the line occurs only five times, but in every instance it marks a textual difficulty.

Though the passages in these Psalms, marked by the line, are by no means all that require emendation, we may at least draw a fairly correct conclusion regarding the relative purity of the text, in each case, from the presence or absence of the sign.

3. NUMBER OF INSERTIONS IN ONE VERSE.

As regards the frequency with which the line may be found in one and the same verse, the following remarks embody the main facts:—

(a) It is only to be expected that the pointer should be placed beside a *single* noteworthy reading in a verse.

* Not always; see subsequent remarks at p. 105 ff.

Thus, in Gen. 15¹³ נִר is marked as abnormal, for we should expect this form, with its accompanying verb, to be in the plural rather than in the singular; in Gen. 19¹⁶ וַיִּתְּמָהּ is noted as a remarkable form, for which וַיִּתְּמָה should perhaps be substituted; in Gen. 21¹⁴ בְּבֶקֶר is marked as really superfluous; and so on.

(b) When *more than one* remarkable reading occurs, the sign should naturally appear with each. This is actually the case in the following passages, which present *two* peculiarities:—

Lev. 10⁶ exhibits a double change of construction, first, in the expression of the 'datives' ('to Aaron, and to Eleazar and Ithamar'), and then in the prohibitive particles (from לֹא to לֹא־); in 10⁹ attention is first called to the singular instead of the plural form of the verb ('drink ye not'), which we should rather expect, and then to the copulative ו instead of the separative וּ. In Josh. 20⁶ we are invited first to note וַיֵּשֶׁב and then וַיֵּשֶׁב, which, though similar in form, are carefully to be distinguished. In 2 Sam. 19⁷ attention is directed to two expressions remarkably similar ('for thou hast declared this day that . . .' and 'for I know this day that . . .'), found in close proximity. See also Ps. 19⁵, Isa. 11¹¹, 2 Kings 19⁴, and list in the Appendix, p. 117 ff.

So also the line sometimes appears three times in a few verses, which contain as many peculiarities.*

(c) On the other hand, even with a plurality of remarkable readings in one and the same verse, the notating

* See the list on p. 14.

scribes frequently contented themselves with inserting a *single* line. This was placed—

Either (1) absolutely at the beginning,* as a general forewarning to expect strange readings further on; †

Or (2) merely with the *first* of several instances, the later being deemed easily discernible by intelligent readers.

An excellent illustration is Ps. 10⁸, showing the line at the opening word, אֲשֶׁר, which must be corrected into אֲשֶׁר; but this is merely the first of several emendations required. Similarly, the line near the beginning of Ps. 22¹⁶ merely marks the first of several alterations necessary before a satisfactory meaning can be educed.‡ Ps. 56⁷ affords another example; Nah. 1¹² similarly presents difficulties at nearly every step. See also Zech. 8¹⁷.

(d) Of the cases in which *two* lines appear in the same verse, the first, placed near the beginning, sometimes proves to be merely premonitory to the second, which more precisely marks the point on which attention is to be fixed.

Thus, in Gen. 3²², the first pointer, placed immediately after the opening word in the verse, merely anticipates the second, whose specific function is to note the obvious anacolouthon,—for, after the introductory ‘lest,’ we certainly expect the expression of a resolve. But the conclusion is wanting.

* After the first word, or combination of words, as will be explained hereafter: see p. 22.

† See illustrations on p. 25 (Section 4).

‡ See the critical commentaries on these passages.

Again, in Deut. 16¹⁶, the first pointer seems needless, except as a preparation for the second, which calls attention to the anthropopathic expression, 'to appear before the Lord.'*

4. EARLY ORIGIN OF THE NOTE-LINE.

It is of the utmost importance to bear in mind that the 'note-line' really dates far back in the history of the Old Testament text,[†] where it has long stood as probably the only mark superadded, at an early stage, to the original Scriptures in their purely consonantal form. Accordingly, this simple and most convenient sign must carefully be distinguished from the marks forming the elaborate 'Massoretic system,'⁽¹⁾ which were added much later,⁽²⁾ being merely superinduced on the then existing text, in which the 'note-line' had long previously found a place. Unfortunately, however, the origin of this mark had already become so thickly veiled in the mists of antiquity, and its real purpose so completely misunderstood, that later editors,—even before the days of the Massoretes,—failing to perceive its proper place and function, gave it an inappropriate and positively misleading name ('Pāsēq,' or 'Pesîq').[‡] Moreover, those who afterwards invented and applied the 'accents' merely increased the confusion, by taking account of the line,

* Further remarks regarding the repeated insertion of the pointer in the same verse will be made at a later stage: see p. 106 ff.

† Fuller remarks on the high antiquity of the pointer will be made, more appropriately, at a later stage: see p. 19.

‡ See the remarks already made on p. 1.

wherever it occurred, as if it were a factor to be considered in applying their system of signs.*

(1) By the 'Massoretic system' proper, we mean the following:—

(a) The frequent marginal note commonly called 'Qērî' (see p. 12).

(b) The 'vowel-points,' with which we associate kindred marks, all latterly invented and applied for guiding readers to the correct *pronunciation* of the sacred text.†

(c) The *accents*.‡ Among accents, however, we must *not* include the note-line, though 'Paseq' is still too frequently regarded as belonging to the accentual system. For, in fact, the Massoretes were not the first to invent and insert this sign, nor did they give it the name by which it has long been currently known. *They found it already existing in the text* that had been handed down to them, and bearing the appellation by which they were themselves misled; and they have, unfortunately, but confirmed the delusion for later readers. Viewing 'Paseq' as if it were really a mark occasionally inserted to separate words in a sentence, they adapted their accentual arrangements in accordance with this erroneous idea, as they deemed best in every passage where it occurred.§

(2) The origin and completion of the 'Massoretic system' must be assigned to an uncertain period in

* Strangely, Wickes regards 'Paseq' as a comparatively late addition, introduced *after* the accents had been applied to the original text ('Treatise on the Prose Accents,' p. 127).

† See p. 14.

‡ See p. 15.

§ See below, p. 17.

the Dark Ages, somewhere between the seventh century and the tenth century of the Christian era. To Jerome, who lived in the fifth century, vowel-points and accents were quite unknown; but when we reach the tenth century, these superadded signs are already in common use.

5. RELATION OF THE LINE TO LATER SIGNS AND MARKS.

The relation of the 'note-line' to the Massoretic marks, properly so called, will be better understood on comparing its true function with the different purposes for which other signs, included in the later system, were introduced. We shall consider—

(1) The 'Kethîb' and the 'Qerî.' The marginal note known as the Qerî (קֶרִי, *i.e.* 'read'*) indicates what the later Jewish scribes or editors confidently proposed to substitute, instead of the Kethîb (כֶּתִיב, *i.e.* *written*), which they thereby marked as a faulty reading in the consonants of the traditional text.

Thus, in Ps. 100³, and Ezra 4², for the Kethîb וְלֹא ('and not'), the Qerî is the similarly sounded וְלוֹ ('and to him'); see also Isa. 9². In Jer. 17¹⁹, for the obviously incorrect עַם, the Qerî is הָעַם ('the people'); in Ezek. 14⁴, for the erroneous Kethîb בָּה, the similarly sounded בֹּא must be read.

Note.—One of the strongest supports of the posi-

* Kautzsch is probably right in contending that this form is rather the *imperative* קֶרִי than the passive participle.

tion that the pointer-line was really designed to call special attention to noteworthy or suspected readings, but that this design was afterwards forgotten, though the line itself was still inserted in the text by faithful copyists, is presented in the fact that we occasionally find *both* the ancient pointer and a later 'Qerî' note at the same suspected spot. Thus, in Ps. 9²¹, *both* the line and the marginal note call attention to the abnormal form מוֹרָה, which should be מוֹרָא. In Ps. 10⁵, *both* marks are attached to דרבו, which should be דִּרְבָּיו. In Prov. 1²⁷, similarly, קִשְׁטָה is marked by both signs, and must be corrected into קִשְׁטָה. In 1 Sam. 2¹⁶, the reading in the received text is וְאָמַר לוֹ, but the marginal Qerî gives לֹא for לוֹ; most probably, however, we should rather read וְאָמַר לוֹ לֹא ('then he used to say to him, No!'). See also Deut. 28⁵⁷, 2 Sam. 14¹⁹, Ps. 55¹⁶ 84⁴ 100³ (in most editions), Isa. 63⁹, Prov. 3²⁸ 27¹⁰, Job 38¹, Ezra 4², Neh. 2¹³, Esth. 1⁵.⁶

Obviously, if the Massoretes had really understood the reason for the presence of the line in the text, they would have felt that there was no need for adding their co-incident Qerî.

(2) The 'Sebîrîn' (סְבִירִין), i.e. *supposed* [correct readings]). The comparatively few cases thus designated are, like the Qerî, suggestions of better readings than those still left in the text uncorrected by those editors who, more confidently, provided us with the notes known as the 'Qerî.' The latter have commonly been regarded as more valuable and important. But there does not appear to be any good reason for making such a distinction. The

Sebîrîn are, rather, *supplementary* corrections of the text derived from other schools of Massoretes — especially the Eastern or Babylonian—than those that gave us the ‘Qerî.’ In fact, some MSS. show that ‘Sebîr’ and ‘Qerî’ are used interchangeably.*

Instances of Sebîrîn are found in Num. 32²⁵ and 1 Sam. 16⁴, where, instead of וַיֵּאמְרוּ, it is reasonably suggested that the plural form וַיֵּאמְרוּ is more correct; and in 1 Sam. 19¹⁰, where, instead of בְּלִילָה הוּא, we should read בְּלִילָה הוּא. Other cases are found in Ex. 25³⁹ 26³¹ etc. See also Num. 33⁸, Deut. 4^{23, 42}, Jer. 5².

Note.—Like some cases of Qerî,† the Sebîrîn occasionally attest the higher antiquity of the Note-line; for the latter is sometimes found with the mark indicating Sebîr, obviously because the reason for inserting the pointer had long been forgotten. Thus, in Gen. 32²³, the defective reading בְּלִילָה הוּא, introduced by the premonitory line, is further marked as one of the Sebîrîn, and the correct reading expressly given as בְּלִילָה הוּא.

(3) *Vowel-marks, and kindred aids to pronunciation.*—The ancient Hebrew, as written, was purely a language of *consonants*. In reading or speaking, however, the required *vowels* had to be supplied, in order to make out the exact sense, which could generally be perceived with ease, on considering the context.‡ So long as the

* See C. D. Ginsburg's learned *Introduction to the Massoretico-critical edition of the Hebrew Bible*, p. 187 ff.

† See above, p. 12, *Note*.

‡ The same holds true of the later or Rabbinical Hebrew.

language continued to be spoken, no pressing necessity was felt for visibly representing the proper vowels which had to be supplied. But when the Hebrew was threatening, in the early Christian centuries, to become a dead language, means were adopted for preserving the traditional pronunciation of every word and letter in the Sacred text, by attaching to the consonants certain signs representing the proper sounds.

With the vowel-signs we here class other helps to pronunciation likewise devised and applied to the consonants for determining the *quality* of sound in certain letters. These additional marks are 'Dagesh' and 'Mappîq,' which require the hard sound of the letters in which they are placed; and 'Raphé,' which demands the soft sound of the consonant over which it appears.

Note.—As these pronunciation-signs are *closely attached* to the consonants which they affect, and were placed there long after the pointer had been introduced into the text,—where it is placed *outside* words (though *between* them), and for another purpose than to indicate pronunciation,—the note-line cannot be put in the same category with these vowel-marks.

(4) *The Accents.*—Speaking generally, the system of 'accents' was invented and applied to the Hebrew text (a) to show the logical or syntactical relation, intimate or remote, deemed to subsist among the different words in a verse. But these signs frequently also (b) mark

the *tone-syllable* * in each word, or group of words, in a verse. It is further affirmed by some (c) that the accents were likewise intended to be guides for musical inflection of the voice in reading the Scriptures; if this be true, it must be confessed that their value in this respect is now practically very small. Only with the first of the positions just indicated have we special concern at present.

Most unfortunately, 'Paseq' has somehow come to be erroneously regarded by many as one of the accents, and thus frequently to be classed with them. In accordance with this assumption, syntactical functions have been baselessly ascribed to the sign. That it really has no place among them, however, will become evident after considering the following facts.

(a) It is noteworthy that whereas the true accents are placed either *above* or *below* the consonants, 'Paseq' is unique in taking its place *between words*, and thus standing in the same line with the consonants. This difference of *position* surely indicates a difference of *purpose*.

See any instance of its occurrence, as in Gen.
1⁵. 10. 21. 29. 30 2⁵. 21. 22 3¹⁴. 15. 22 etc.

(b) 'Paseq' never has been and never can be proved, even by those who claim for it a place within the accentual system, to possess *independent* force as an 'accent.' Its

* Certain of the accents, however, are uniformly attached to the *first* letter of a word (and are accordingly called 'prepositive'), even though the tone falls at a later point; others are invariably placed on the *last* consonant (and are thus called 'postpositive'), though the tone may fall earlier.

most strenuous advocates are forced to acknowledge that, even according to their own account, *it is always combined with one of the accents proper*, from which it derives support.

For instance, in the ordinary ('prose') books of the Hebrew Scriptures, when preceded by the sub-linear 'conjunctive' accent Munach (thus ַ), and immediately followed by the 'great distinctive' accent Rebhia (ֿ), the compound is currently known as 'Legarmeh'; see Gen. 3¹⁵ 17¹⁴ 19⁹ etc. The same combination of Munach with 'Paseq' (viz. ַ), if immediately followed by any other accent than Rebhia, is simply called 'Munach-Paseq'; see Gen. 7²¹ 13¹⁰ 18²¹ 19¹⁴ (double instance), etc. Less common collocations are 'Merka-Paseq' (ַ) found in Gen. 30¹⁶, 'Darga-Paseq' (ַֿ) which occurs in Gen. 30⁸ etc. All such distinctions have merely an artificial or theoretical basis, inasmuch as the real origin and purpose of 'Paseq' have been misconceived.

Moreover, when 'Paseq' happens to be omitted* in certain MSS. or printed editions of the Hebrew Scriptures, no practical inconvenience results from the accent becoming simple Munach, Merka, etc.

It is further to be noted that, considering the proper meaning of 'Paseq' (viz. 'separating') and its alleged function, all such combinations of this sign with a conjunctive accent are self-contradictory. The resultant of such (supposed) opposing forces (*i.e.* separative and connective) might safely be regarded as an equilibrium.

(c) Finding 'Paseq' practically incapable of being

* See the remarks at pp. 3 and 105 ff.

legitimately assigned to a fitting place among the accents, some writers on the subject relegate the treatment of this sign to an appendix in which its irreducible character is acknowledged. Such is the course pursued by Dr. W. Wickes in his learned and laborious treatise on the Prose Accents.* When even the Massorettes, in superadding the accents to the Sacred text, took into account the presence of 'Paseq,' which they already found there, and modified their arrangements accordingly, it is not surprising that later scholars have continued to show similar deference.

The views of Wickes regarding the origin and purpose of the line are thus presented by himself:—
 'After the verse had been arranged musically, according to the rules . . . two or more words might be left joined by the accents, which it might nevertheless seem desirable, for the sake of effect in the reading, to separate by a slight pause. The sign Paseq . . . was placed between the words for this purpose. The meaning of the term ("cutting off," "separating") indicates its function. This sign had no proper musical value, and was therefore not numbered among the accents.' †

PARTIAL SUMMARY OF RESULTS.

From what has been already stated, it will be obvious that ordinary readers of a modern Hebrew Bible have

* P. 121.

† *Treatise on the Prose Books of the Old Testament*, p. 120.

before them, on the printed page, what is really *a series of different strata, deposited at various stages in history*,—the later being superimposed on the earlier. Though the whole has now assumed a semblance of unity, the successive layers are really distinct, and still separable by intelligent observers. For our present purpose, it is essential that we should place and retain clearly before our mental vision only the following:—

1. The Hebrew consonants, which form the primary portion of the sacred writings.

2. The note-line, which formed the first addition made to the original text.

All later additions—the vowel-signs (except as helps in fixing the exact reading of words), the accents, and such marginal notes as the ‘Qerî’ and ‘Sebîrîn’—must be practically excluded from thought during our investigations.

6. ANTIQUITY OF THE NOTE-LINE.

The early origin of this mark is evidenced in various ways.

- (1) The very *simplicity of the sign* seems to prove its ancient date. A mere line is certainly the most primitive mark that could well be conceived. On the other hand, complex marks, and an elaborate system of these, such as are presented in the accents especially, are obviously the product of later times; the straight and simple line had already been applied to serve a primary purpose. The simplest, as a rule, comes first.

(2) The fact that many palpable difficulties in the text are now wholly unmarked, suggests the thought that a large proportion of these difficulties originated *after*—perhaps long after—the line had been fixed on as a sign, and inserted at points where earlier slips had been already detected and noted. For, had those (presumably) later ones actually existed when the line was first used, these also would surely have been marked by the primitive sign.

For instance, Prov. 13 and 14 now contain a considerable number of textual difficulties, not one of which is marked; yet the line notes others elsewhere in the same book, as in chaps. 6. 8. 24, etc.

(3) The frequent coincidence of the note-line with a marginal correction in the form of a 'Qerí,'* shows that the pointer which earlier scribes had already inserted had really no significance for their followers in later days. To these, it was a meaningless *mark*, but not a *sign*.

(4) Many readings *already marked by the line* as questionable or unintelligible *are confirmed by the testimony of the Septuagint* and other ancient Versions as already existent when these translations were made. A few illustrations will make this plain.

In Ps. 22¹⁶, the line is inserted to mark 'חִי (‘my strength’) as a questionable reading; nevertheless, the Septuagint (ὡς ἰσχύς μου) confirms this. But Olshausen, Ewald, and others reasonably maintain

* See remarks already made at p. 13.

that the genuine reading is **הָכִי** ('my palate'), which accords with the preceding parallel 'my tongue.'

In Josh. 6¹⁹, the first word in the expression **וְכֹל** + **בְּכֶף** ('and all silver'), which is noted by the line as questionable, ought rather to be **וְכֵלִי** ('and vessels of'), as shown by the succeeding context. But the Septuagint translator, by his rendering (*παν ἀργύριον*), shows that the questioned reading was already in the Hebrew copy from which he made his Version.

In Ps. 18⁹, for the last word—noted by the line—in the anthropopathic expression **וְעָלָה עֵשֶׁן** + **בְּאַפִּי**, we should probably read, in accordance with the parallel clause following ('and fire from his mouth devoured') **מֵאַפָּי** ('out of his nostrils'); but the Septuagint (*ἀνέβη καπνὸς ἐν ὀργῇ αὐτοῦ*) confirms the Massoretic text.

In Ps. 59⁸, the pointer marks the first word **הֵנָּה** as at least questionable; but the Septuagint (*ἰδοὺ*) confirms the reading, which nevertheless should be corrected into **הֵנִי** ('they'). This term thus presents the required antithesis to **וְאַתָּה** ('but thou') following.

In Ps. 125³, the *second* occurrence of 'the righteous' seems reasonably marked as superfluous; yet the Septuagint attests its presence in the Hebrew text when this translation was made.

Note.—It seems impossible to determine the pre-Christian century during which the note-line was introduced. But the insertion must have commenced *after* the origin of 'final' forms in certain letters of the Hebrew alphabet; for, in Neh. 2¹³ **הֵם** (for **הֵם**) is marked as abnormal, both by the line and in the

marginal Qerî.* Similarly, קִי (for קִי) is doubly noted in Job 38¹ 40⁶.

7. PROPER PLACE FOR THE INSERTION OF THE POINTER.

When we come to investigate the principles according to which the ancient scribes seem to have inserted the note-line, it is only to be expected that the *most natural and fitting place should be, as nearly as possible, the precise point where the peculiarity occurs*. This actually is the general rule, but there are exceptions which cannot all be accounted for. The following observations present the main facts regarding the insertion of the line:—

(1) The pointer always lies *within* the series of words forming a verse, *i.e.* it never precedes the first word, or follows the last.

The very *earliest* stage at which the sign can be introduced is immediately after the first word in a verse, or section of a verse (see Gen. 15¹ 23¹⁷, Ps. 55¹⁶ 59⁸ 96⁵ 118²⁷ etc. etc.); and the very *latest* point of insertion is immediately before the last word (see Ps. 10³ 58⁷ 89⁵³ etc.).

(2) Apart from the ruling principle just enunciated, *the line should immediately precede* the point to which the scribe desired to call the reader's attention.

Among abundant illustrations may be cited Amos 1¹, where attention is called to the shortened form עֲיִיָּה there used instead of the full form עֲיִיָּהּ in Isa. 1¹ and elsewhere; Hos. 13², where, instead of the future יִסְכֵּן, we should rather probably read the

* See remarks on p. 13.

perfect יָסַפִּי; Gen. 3¹⁵, where the more rare and poetic form אָשִׁית is found, instead of the more common prose form אָשִׁים; Num. 11³², where יוֹם is noted as really superfluous; Isa. 63¹¹, where attention is called to the abnormal form הַמַּעֲלֵם, a participle having both the article prefixed and a pronominal fragment affixed; Isa. 37²⁴, where the line notes the unexpected occurrence of the Divine name אֲרֵנִי instead of יְהוָה or אֱלֹהִים; Isa. 63¹, where, instead of the last word in the expression מִי־יָהּ בָּא, we expect הַבָּא, but the article has been omitted after the preceding ה in the demonstrative. See also Ps. 96¹³, where a needless repetition of בִּי בָּא is marked; Jer. 1¹⁰, where 'this day' is superfluous; 1 Sam. 10¹⁸, where there is an unnecessary insertion of the words 'to the children of Israel.'

(3) A corollary derived from the two leading principles already stated is,—that whenever the noteworthy form happens to be the *first* word in the whole verse, or even the first word in a later clause of the verse, the line does not precede, but *follows* the form.

(a) We shall first cite instances in which a *single* word, beginning a sentence or main clause, is marked by the line placed *after* it.

In Ex. 9¹⁴, attention is called to the opening word כִּי, instead of which we should doubtless read לוֹ ('If'), as obviously required by the following correlative עָתָה כִּי (introducing the apodosis of a pure hypothesis) in v.¹⁵; in Ex. 16²⁹, the line after וְשָׁבִי, which begins the second half of the verse, shows that the word should rather be שְׁבִיתוּ ('rest

ye'); in Judg. 16², the line after the first word לַעֲזָתִים ('to the Gazites') notes the need, in front, of some such word as וַיִּנָּר ('And it was told'); in Ps. 10², the line after יִתְפָּשֵׁוּ, which begins the second half of the verse, notes the change of form from the singular to the plural; in Ps. 96⁵ and in Jer. 4²², the pointer, following the first word בִּי, marks this as superfluous; in Ezek. 13¹¹, the perfect הָיָה, beginning the second part of the verse, and marked by the line following, is noted as an error for the future יִהְיֶה; in 2 Chron. 23¹⁰, the pointer after וַאֲשֵׁי, which is the first word in the second clause, indicates that the correct reading is simply אִשִּׁי; in Ps. 45⁵, the mark after the opening word וַהֲרִרְךָ has been inserted to note this form as a superfluous repetition from the end of the preceding verse; in Ps. 65⁶, the line after the first word נִזְרָאוֹת questions the correctness of this form, for which we should perhaps rather read אֲתָה ('Dreadful [art] thou').

See also Ex. 12^{15, 19}, Isa. 18², Jer. 50³⁴.

(b) Similarly, when a *whole clause* is intended to be marked as noteworthy or doubtful, the line is placed after the first word, or series of words. For instance, in the familiar formula, 'Thus saith Jehovah,' the entire expression may be marked, as at least superfluous, by a line inserted after the initial word (בֹּהַ אֲמַר יְהוָה). Examples occur in Nah. 1¹² (the only passage in this book where the formula is found), 2 Kings 3¹⁷, Jer. 2⁵ 9²² 10² 17⁵ and frequently elsewhere. In all these instances the expression may be omitted without injury to the context.* See

* See a fuller discussion on this expression, at p. 48.

2 Sam. 19⁷ for *two* remarkably similar expressions, both noted by the line after the first word in each.

(4) Sometimes, however, the pointer-line is inserted, not immediately before a peculiarity or peculiarities occurring in the middle or at the end of a verse, but, by way of premonition, either (*a*) after the first word in the clause containing the peculiarity, or even (*b*) at the beginning of the verse, though the difficulty may be at the end. In such cases, the line merely gives a general warning to look for peculiarities or difficulties further on.

See Prov. 9⁷, where the line, though inserted after the first word in the verse, really points to the last word, מוֹמוֹ, for which מָאוֹס ('contempt') should be read. In Ps. 68⁵, the line inserted after the first word merely prepares the mind of the reader for several difficulties further on (for סָלָו, read צִהְלָו; for בַּעֲרֵבוֹת, read בַּעֲבֹת; and for the second שָׁמוֹ, read שְׁמָחוֹ). In Ps. 135⁹, the line at the beginning points onward to בְּתוֹכֵי, for which בְּתוֹךְ is the better reading. Ps. 146⁸ begins thus: יְהוָה פָּתַח עֵינָיו; the difficulty, however, is not at the commencement, where the pointer appears, but after the second word, where עֵינֵי has been inadvertently omitted in transcription, in consequence of its resemblance to the succeeding word: we must thus render the first part of the sentence, 'Jehovah opens [the eyes of] the blind.' Similarly, though the next verse (v.⁹) of the same Psalm begins with the words יְהוָה שָׁמַר אֶת־גֵּרִים, the pointer should really be inserted later, before אֶת־, whose occurrence there is anomalous,

particularly when we consider its absence from other accusatives which follow. In Ex. 26², and again in v.⁸, the note-line, though inserted at the beginning, should have been placed further on, to show precisely where a remarkable dislocation is made between the construct וְרֹחַב and its genitive הַיְרִיעָה הָאֶחָת, through the abnormal interjection of אֲרָבַע בָּאֶמָה. In Ex. 29²⁷, similarly, the line is prematurely inserted before 'the breast of the wave-offering,' instead of after this, where we ought to find the wrongly deferred relative clause 'which is waved.' In Ps. 19⁵, we read יֵצֵא קוֹלָם¹ בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ; the line is really designed to call attention to the last of these words, before which it would have been more conveniently placed, and instead of which we should read (as shown by the Septuagint rendering, *ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν*) קוֹלָם ('their voice'). In Job 24, the line appears in no fewer than eight verses (vv.^{5, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 24}), all with the sign near the beginning, though the difficulties are found later on. In Ps. 66⁶, the line near the beginning prepares us for textual difficulties towards the end of the verse, where, for יַעֲבִירוּ, we should read עֲבִירָנוּ, and for נִשְׁמְחָה put נִשְׁמְרָנוּ, so that the correct rendering runs thus: 'He turned sea into dry land; through the flood we passed on foot; there were we preserved by him.' In Ps. 94²³, the pointer near the beginning prepares us for the strange repetition of יַצְמִיחֵם near the end. In Ps. 81¹¹, the sign prepares us for the later appearance of the unusual form הַמַּעֲלֶלֶךְ in which *both* the article and a pronominal suffix are attached to a participle. In Ps. 109²¹, the early insertion of the line leads us

to conclude that there has been an omission of **הָפַךְ**, which the imperative **עֲשֵׂה** seems to require as its fitting object; similarly, in v.²⁵, the pointer at the beginning forewarns us that **לָהֶם** appears instead of **לָעַם הֵם**. Isa. 54² exhibits the pointer at the beginning of the verse, but the difficulty is really in the middle, where, for **יָפִי**, we must restore **הָפִי** as the correct reading (following the Septuagint and other Versions). In Neh. 3³⁴ [4² in English], though the pointer follows the first **וַיֵּאמָר**, at the beginning of the verse, it really calls attention to the second, which forms a needless repetition. In Gen. 48⁷, the line anticipatively prepares us for the omission, later, of 'Aram' after 'from Padan,' as attested by the Septuagint, Samaritan, and Syriac. In Neh. 13²³, the pointer after the opening word forewarns us of the omission, at a later stage, of the relative 'who.' In Ps. 20⁶, the line after the opening word really points onwards to **נִרְפָּל**, for which we must read **נִנְיָל** ('we shall exult'), as required by the parallelism. In Ps. 80², the line near the beginning really calls attention to the omission, later (in the middle of the verse, after the words 'thou that leadest Joseph like a flock'), of another imperative such as 'hear!' In Zech. 1⁶, the line after the initial word points to the substitution, at a later stage, of **הַשָּׁבִי** for **הִשְׁבֵּנוּ** ('we they restrained').

See also Lev. 11⁴², Jer. 11¹⁹ 30¹⁸, Zech. 8¹⁷.

Note. — Comparatively rare are cases in which peculiarities at the *end* of a verse are marked by the line placed there; but see Ps. 5⁷ 10³ 40¹⁶ 72¹⁹,

1 Chron. 29¹¹, 2 Chron. 12⁶, Jer. 11⁵ 23⁶ 33²; 2 Kings 3¹⁶ etc.

(5) Special consideration is claimed for instances—which are now, however, comparatively rare—of the *double* note-line, or, to speak more correctly, the *pair* of note-lines enclosing the noteworthy form between them.* Possibly, this repetition of the line (after as well as before the form noted) may really exhibit the original mode in which peculiarities were marked. If this be so, then the single line—usually the first,† but sometimes ‡ the second—has come to be regarded as sufficient, and the other has been dropped, as superfluous, especially when *single* words are noted as remarkable.

Compare the full marking as found in Ezek. 33¹¹ יְהוָה אֶרְנֵי יְהוָה | נָאֵם | חִי־אֲנִי, with the simpler noting in Ezek. 34⁸ יְהוָה אֶרְנֵי יְהוָה | נָאֵם | חִי־אֲנִי; compare also Ps. 40¹⁷ יְשִׁישׁוּ וַיִּשְׁמְחוּ | בְּךָ | יְשִׁישׁוּ וַיִּשְׁמְחוּ | בְּךָ | יְשִׁישׁוּ וַיִּשְׁמְחוּ in Ps. 70⁵. Compare also 1 Sam. 18¹⁰ with 19⁹.

This double note-line now appears in only a few passages in certain Books of the Old Testament, chiefly Numbers, Joshua, Samuel, Kings, Psalms, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel; and the purpose of its insertion was evidently to indicate that the word or expression enclosed is either superfluous, or has been substituted for another which should be restored, or has been misplaced in the sentence.

* This collocation must not be confounded with the more frequent occurrence of *two single and separate* note-lines, calling attention to *two different* peculiarities in the same verse, as found in Ex. 32¹, Deut. 7²⁶, Josh. 1¹⁵, 2 Sam. 19⁷, Ps. 39¹³ 40⁶ 66⁷ etc. etc. See the fuller list on p. 3. See also p. 8.

† See above, p. 22.

‡ See below, p. 30.

Thus, in the expression $\text{לְחֵצִי} \mid \text{שִׁבְטִי} \mid \text{מִנְשֵׁה}$ ('to the half-tribe of Manasseh'), Num. 32³³, the pair of lines encloses a word unusual in this Book for designating 'tribe,'* for which מִטָּה is the proper form in such a connection: see Num. 34^{13, 14, 15}. In 1 Sam. 24¹⁰, a superfluous word ('to-day'), already used earlier in the verse, is enclosed within a pair of lines, thus, $\text{בְּיָדִי} \mid \text{הַיּוֹם} \mid \text{נִתְּנָה יְהוָה} \mid$. In Prov. 6³ $\text{אֶפֶס} \mid$ is marked as probably a transcriptional slip for אֶתָּא . In Esth. 9²⁷ עַל־נַפְשָׁם is marked as written for עֲלֵיהֶם , which is correctly given in v.³¹. In Isa. 66²⁰, the enclosed expression מִבְּל־הַנּוֹמִים is marked as awkwardly placed in the sentence, which would run more smoothly if the clause were transposed to some other point. In 1 Kings 21² לֵאמֹר has probably been marked as superfluous.

See other illustrations of the double line in Num. 4²⁶ 31³⁰ (cf. v.⁴⁷), 2 Sam. 24¹³, Ezra 6⁹, Ps. 55^{20, 24} 84⁴ 141⁴, 2 Kings 18¹⁴, 1 Chron. 21¹⁵, Jer. 4¹⁹ 29³² 35¹⁵ 44²⁶ 51³⁷, Josh. 8³³ 19⁵¹ 22²², Ezek. 47¹² 48²¹.

Passages in which only the *first* of the two lines now appear are Jer. 1¹⁰, where the two words 'this day' seem marked as superfluous; Ps. 92¹⁰, where the words 'Jehovah, for behold thine enemies' form an unnecessary repetition; Ps. 93³, where 'Jehovah' and the two following words are redundant.

(6) Though the single note-line, as has already been shown, normally precedes the peculiarity thus marked, and should follow only when this happens to be the first

* See the author's *Studies in Hebrew Synonyms*, p. 123.

word in a verse, or member of a verse,* yet there are many cases in which it *follows*—sometimes even at a distance—a peculiar word, or combination of words,† which is *not* the first in its own sentence or clause⁽¹⁾. This post-inserted line may in some rare instances be (a) merely the later survivor of an original *pair* of note-lines⁽²⁾, but (b) more frequently the abnormal insertion is evidently due to the action of a later scribe, who inadvertently inserted the single line at the wrong point⁽³⁾.

1. In Prov. 30¹⁹, the line *follows* the form הַנִּצֵּר ('the eagle'), which it marks as unique in having the article, while all other similar nouns are anarthrous. In Isa. 18², the pointer follows לְבִי ('go ye'), but should rather be placed in front, to show the omission of לְאֹמֶר there. Num. 15³⁰ shows the line following תַּעֲשֶׂה, which should rather be תַּעֲשֶׂק ('oppresses'). In Num. 8¹⁹, the line following נְתַנִּים ('given') marks the word as really superfluous; similarly, in 32³³, the pointer after לָהֶם notes it as needless. In Isa. 52¹, the line should be placed earlier in the sentence, to note there a reading which does not, in its present form, exhibit proper parallelism between the first and the second parts. In Ps. 69¹⁴, the line is now placed at a point where no change seems to be required; but emendations are necessary, both before and after. In Ps. 91⁷, the pointer follows, but should rather precede, מַצְרֵד, for

* See p. 22.

† The union of two words by Maqqeph is so close that the pointer, if postponed, must follow the second, even though the *first* is meant to be signalised: see פִּסְתֵּי־בַר in Ps. 72¹⁶.

which obviously we must read מִיָּדָד. In Ps. 125³, the line appears after, instead of before, the second occurrence of הַצְדִּיקִים, which is really superfluous. Prov. 1²⁷ shows the line following instead of preceding the faulty reading בְּשִׂאָה, which is corrected in the Qerî as בְּשׂוֹאָה. In 2 Chron. 20²², the note-line is inserted after the remarkable reading in מִאֲרָבִים יָהוָה יָנַח יְהוֹה ('Jehovah placed men in ambush'); for 'Jehovah,' some substitute 'Judah' (יְהוּדָה). It is instructive to compare Lev. 7¹⁶, where the line is (normally) *prefixed* to אִו (which should be אִם), with v.²¹, where it *follows* the same reading. In Ps. 22²⁷, the note-line follows the suspected reading עֲנִיִּים, for which רָעִבִים ('hungry') would be a suitable substitute. In Mal. 3¹, the pointer should precede rather than follow הָאֲדֹנָי, which is marked as an unusual Divine name. In Ps. 5⁷, the line follows יִתְעַב, which is thus noted as the only instance, in the whole Psalm, of the 3rd person being employed in relation to God; everywhere else, 'thou' occurs. In Judg. 20²⁵, the line should not be behind בְּנִימֹן, but in front, where בְּנִי has inadvertently been dropped, through its similarity to what follows. In Ps. 9¹⁴, the pointer should not follow, but precede יְהוָה, so as to call attention to the unusual form הִנֵּנִי at the beginning of the verse. In 2 Sam. 24¹³, in the expression שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים רָעַב בְּאֶרֶץ, the pair of note-lines should *not* enclose 'famine,' as the remarkable term, but 'seven,' which puts its own clause out of harmony with the other two correlative clauses following, both of which present the number 'three'; the numbers are correctly stated in the parallel account

found in 1 Chron. 21¹². In Jer. 27¹⁸, where we read הַנֹּחֲתִים | הַבָּלִים | בָּאוּ לְבִלְתִּי, the line should rather be next בָּאוּ, which it really was intended to mark as a strikingly irregular construction. Similarly, in Jer. 31³⁹, where the opening words are | וְכָל-הָעָמֶק הַפְּנִימִי | וְהַדְּשֵׁן, the pointer should rather be close to the irregular form 'valley,' which is in the construct state, and thus should not have the article prefixed. In 1 Sam. 9²⁴, the line should be placed earlier in the sentence, beside וְהַעֲלִיָּה, which really must be read וְהָאֵלִיָּה ('and the fat tail'), instead of coming later (thus וְהָאֵלִיָּה | לְפָנַי שְׂאוֹל | וַיֵּשֶׁם), where it is out of place. In Ps. 65¹⁴ הָרִים must be restored as הָרִים ('mountains'), but the note-line should have been placed before, instead of after the contested reading. In 2 Chron. 35²⁵ וַיֵּאָמְרוּ should be וַיֵּאָבְלוּ ('and they mourned'), but the pointer ought to be placed close to the disputed reading instead of coming later.

Many other instances will easily be detected by an observant reader. But reference may further be made to Ex. 16²⁹, Deut. 6²² 7¹ 12¹⁵, Josh. 22³², 1 Sam. 14³⁶, 2 Kings 11¹⁵, Ps. 84¹², Prov. 3²⁸, Eccles. 6², Isa. 23¹⁷.

2. That a pointer following the noteworthy reading may sometimes really be the remaining *second* of an enclosing pair of lines, seems conclusively proved by comparing Ezek. 34⁸ with 33¹¹, and Ps. 70⁵ with 40¹⁷, as already exhibited.* In 2 Kings 2⁴, the line after 'Elisha,' which marks it as superfluous, is probably but the latter of two enclosing lines.

3. Ortenberg † pertinently reminds us of similar

* See p. 28.

† Stade's *Zeitschrift für alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1887, pp. 301-2.

misplacements, and even omissions, by later copyists, of the significant signs—viz. the asterisk and the obelus—introduced by Origen, in his *Hexapla*, into the text of his copy of the Septuagint, to mark differences between this and the Hebrew text. Such unfortunate transpositions have lessened the value of the *Syro-Hexaplar* as a witness for these ancient texts. A single page of this translation presents abundant illustrations of these misplacements by transcribers.

In 2 Chron. 35²¹, the double note-line enclosing לֵאמֹר is certainly misplaced; no difficulty is apparent there, but several difficulties occur later. In Judg. 14¹⁵, the pointer should be placed later, beside הַשְּׁבִיעִי 'the seventh,' which should be הַרְבִּיעִי 'the fourth,' as proved by the Septuagint (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τετάρτῃ). In Ps. 57⁴, the line appears too soon, and should rather precede הַרְרָה, which has most probably been substituted for מִהַרְרָב ('from the sword').

Other misplacements are found in Gen. 7²³ 30²⁰, Ex. 7¹⁷ 13¹⁸, Num. 3³⁸, Josh. 5⁴ 20⁹, Judg. 6² 10⁴ 18¹⁰, 1 Sam. 11⁷, 2 Sam. 19^{1.38}, 2 Chron. 26¹⁵, Cant. 4⁸ etc.

Regarding *repeated* insertions of the line in the same verse, see the remarks already made on pp. 3, 7 ff.

II.

CLASSIFICATION OF CASES.

8. CONDITIONS FOR INSERTION OF THE LINE.

Instances showing the line may be grouped thus—

(I) Passages are marked in which *an unusual form of the Divine name* occurs.

In the Book of Malachi, the Divine name generally employed is יהוה (1¹. 2. 4. 7 etc.), or יהוה צבאות (1⁴. 8. 9. 10. 11. 13 etc.); but when יהוה אפרון appears in 3¹, the singularity is noted by the line placed after it.

In the Book of Exodus, the Divine name employed at the beginning is simply אלהים, and afterwards יהוה, or the double designation יהוה אלהים. But, in Ex. 15²⁶, attention is called to the compound name יהוה אלהיך, so common in Deuteronomy, though strange here; moreover, in Ex. 23¹⁷ and 34²³, the line notes the remarkable combination יהוה יהוה אפרון.

In Genesis, Divine names commonly found are אלהים, יהוה, אל, שדי. But, in Gen. 24⁷, where Abraham is represented as employing the expression יהוה אלהי השמים, the line has been inserted to show that this is a somewhat unusual combination. Further, the trusted servant of Abraham is repre-

sented, in 24¹², as employing a peculiar designation, viz. $\text{יְהוָה} \mid \text{אֱלֹהֵי אֲדָנִי אֲבָרָהֶם}$, which is duly marked by the note-line. (The sign is *not* repeated, however, when the designation recurs in vv. 27. 42. 48. *)

In Deuteronomy, the Divine name usually employed is 'Jehovah our God,' 'Jehovah your God,' or 'Jehovah thy God' (see 1⁶. 10. 19. 20. 21 etc.); but in 3²⁰, where the expression $\text{יְהוָה} \mid \text{לְאַחֵיכֶם}$ occurs, the line notes distinctly that אֱלֹהֵיכֶם is *not* there.

Josh. 22²² is specially remarkable for the *twofold* occurrence of the unusual expression $\text{יְהוָה} \mid \text{אֱלֹהִים} \mid \text{אֵל}$, in which a *pair* of pointers appears each time.

In the Book of Judges, the ordinary designation, יְהוָה , is of course left unmarked; but in 4⁶ 6⁸ and 11²³, where $\text{יְהוָה} \mid \text{אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ is employed, this fuller name is noted by the line. (The sign, however, is not inserted in 5³ or 11²¹.)

In 1 Chron. 13⁶, the line is inserted to mark the expression $\text{יְהוָה} \mid \text{אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים}$ as quite peculiar.

In 2 Chron. 30¹⁹, $\text{יְהוָה} \mid \text{אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ} \mid \text{הָאֱלֹהִים}$ is noted by the line as unusual.

In Isa. 37, various Divine names are employed, such as 'Jehovah thy God' (v. 4 twice), 'Jehovah' (vv. 6. 14 twice, 15. 17 twice, 18. 20. 22. 33. 34. 36), 'thy God' (v. 10), 'Jehovah of Hosts' (vv. 16. 32), 'the God of Israel' (v. 16), 'Jehovah, the God of Israel' (v. 21), 'the Holy One of Israel' (v. 23); all of these, however, are unmarked, as not uncommon. But when אֲדָנִי appears in v. 24, it is marked as unique, by the juxtaposition of the line. In Isa. 40²⁸, again, the rare occurrence of the name אֱלֹהֵי עוֹלָם is noted by the

* See later, p. 106 ff.

post-inserted line. In Isa. 42⁵, the pointer in the combination יהוה האל notes this as remarkable.

In Jeremiah, יהוה is the name generally employed, sometimes also יהוה צבאות is found (9^{6, 16} 11¹⁷ etc.); but, in 4¹⁰ and 7²⁰, where the combination ארני יהוה occurs, this is marked by a line in front, calling attention to the peculiarity. In the same book, the expression נאם יהוה frequently occurs (see 22²⁴ 23^{4, 7, 11, 23, 28, 29} 27^{8, 15, 22} 29^{11, 14, 19}), and is accordingly left unmarked; but when we reach 30⁸, the fuller expression יהוה צבאות נאם is marked as noteworthy.

In Lam. 1¹⁵ 2^{1, 5, 7}, the line notes the unexpected occurrence of ארני instead of יהוה elsewhere.

In Ps. 44, אלהים is used five times (vv.^{2, 5, 9, 21, 22}), but ארני only once, in v.²⁴; this unique occurrence is noted by the prefixed line. In Ps. 50, אלהים is generally found, but v.¹ presents the peculiar compound אלהים יהוה אל, which naturally has received the line to mark its singularity. In Ps. 55²⁰, the unique occurrence of אל is marked by a pair of pointers.* In Ps. 57¹⁰, the line prefixed to ארני calls attention to this as the sole occurrence of the name in the whole poem. In Ps. 68¹⁹, the line placed before יה אלהים obviously notes the combination as remarkable; in v.²¹, the line after האל has been inserted for a similar reason. Ps. 72¹⁸ presents the remarkably full expression יהוה אלהים אלהי ישראל, which is rightly noted as uncommon. Throughout Ps. 89, the Divine name commonly employed is simply יהוה; but in v.⁹ the pointer is first inserted in the lengthened expression אלהי צבאות יהוה, and then before the contracted

* See p. 28.

form יה־; moreover, in v.⁵⁰, where a further change is made to אֶרְנִי, the prefixed line calls attention to the fact. In Ps. 118, יהוה is the Divine name generally employed; but when, in v.²⁷, אל is prefixed to it, the combination is marked by the line.

Ezekiel mostly uses יהוה (1³. 28 3¹⁶. 22 4¹³ etc.) and אֶרְנִי (2⁴ 3¹¹ 5⁵ 6³ [twice] etc.); but at the first introduction of the compound אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in 9³, the change is noted by the line prefixed; the mark, however, is not repeated later (10¹⁹. 20).

(2) The line is frequently inserted *between two adjacent words in which the initial letter of the second is the same as the final letter of the first*. Still more frequently is the insertion made *when the same letter is repeated three times in succession*. Distinct assurance is thus given that this consecutive repetition of the same letter is not the result of mere inadvertence.

In Deut. 1⁷, attention is called to פָּנָיו וְסָעוּ 'turn ye and march' (contrast קוֹמוּ פָּעוּ in 2²⁴). In Ex. 20⁴ and the parallel Deut. 5⁸, presenting part of the fourth commandment, we are invited to mark the striking collocation of the same letter thrice in succession, in the expression מְפֹעֵל בְּשָׁמַיִם 'in the heavens above'; similarly in 1 Sam. 20²¹, we find מִפְּךָ הַחֲצִים 'the arrows [are] from thee'; in Isa. 6² occurs the expression עֹמְדִים מְפֹעֵל 'standing above.' In Ps. 68³⁶ we are called to note מְפֹקֶד־שִׁיד אֱלֹהִים; in 143⁵ occurs מִפְּדִים זְכוֹרָתִי יָמִים 'I remember days of old'; in 3⁸ יהוה הוֹשִׁיעֲנִי is similarly marked. Again, in Judg. 13⁷ attention is called to יֵין אֶל-תִּשְׁתֵּי 'drink not wine' (but the same expression is left

unmarked in v.⁵ *); in Job 37¹⁴ to נִפְלְאוֹת אֵל | וְהִתְבּוֹן |; in 1 Chron. 22³ to לְרֹב | וּבְרֹל |, and similarly in v.⁵ to לְמַעַלָּה | לְהַנְדִּיל |; in Lev. 27¹⁶ to מִשְׁרָה אֲהַדָּתוֹ | וְאִם | (where the מ is no doubt superfluous; see p. 45).†

See also Ex. 17⁷, Deut. 13⁶, Ps. 68²¹ 86⁹ 128³, Ezek. 16¹⁴, 2 Chron. 15³ 20¹ 34¹², Job 27¹³.

Cases in which the line is omitted are Num. 23²², Deut. 4³⁹ 15⁶, Isa. 45⁸.

(3) Conversely, the line is sometimes inserted between two words, the first of which does *not* end, as might have been expected, with the same letter as that with which the second begins; or the second of which does not begin with the same letter as that with which the first concludes.

Thus, in Deut. 9⁷ we find יֵצֵאתָ | מֵאֶרֶץ | ‘thou didst go out from the land,’ where the line has been inserted to assure us that the form before it is not the plural יֵצְאתֶם, as the plurals following might lead us to expect; and in Ezek. 16⁵² occurs the reading שְׂאִי | נִסְ-אֵתָ | ‘do thou also bear,’ with the line inserted to assure us that the form succeeding it is the imperative, and *not* the future תִּשְׂאִי.

* See subsequent remarks, p. 109f.

† It must here be conceded that the line might appropriately be regarded as a ‘separator’ in such instances as have now been cited. The sign in these cases may certainly be viewed as pointing out the necessity for distinctly enunciating the termination of the word preceding it, and the commencement of the word following, so as to avoid the natural tendency to run both words together, owing to the identity of the adjacent letters. But, as will gradually be shown, the total number of such instances, in which the designation ‘Paseq’ would be suitable, forms but a small proportion of the whole in which the line appears.

(4) The line is regularly inserted *between two words identical in form*. In this case also, the sign assures us that this consecutive repetition of the same word, or words, either (a) is *not* an inadvertent error committed by a transcriber, or (b) is a needless repetition which should be corrected.

Observe יום יום 'daily' in Gen. 39¹⁰, Ex. 16⁵, Ps. 61⁹ 68²⁰, Prov. 8^{31, 34}, and frequently elsewhere. In Ex. 34⁶ we find יהוה יהוה; in Num. 5²² and Neh. 8⁶ אָמֵן אָמֵן 'Amen, Amen!' (Ps. 41¹⁴ וְאָמֵן אָמֵן); in Lev. 13⁴⁵ טָמֵא טָמֵא 'Unclean, unclean!' in Zech. 4⁷ הֵן הֵן; in Isa. 26³ 57¹⁹ שָׁלוֹם שָׁלוֹם 'Peace, peace'; in Ps. 35²¹ 40¹⁶ 70⁴ הָאֵחָה הָאֵחָה 'Aha, Aha!' Especially noteworthy is the triple repetition קְדוֹשׁ קְדוֹשׁ קְדוֹשׁ 'Holy, holy, holy!' in Isa. 6³. The pointer similarly calls attention to the actual repetition of a name in direct address, as 'Abraham, Abraham!' in Gen. 22¹¹; 'Jacob, Jacob!' in Gen. 46²; 'Samuel, Samuel!' in 1 Sam. 3¹⁰. Very striking is the marked repetition סָבִיב סָבִיב 'all round about' in Ezek. 40^{5, 14, 16, 17, 25, 29, 33, 36, 43}, and in 41^{5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19} 42^{15, 20}. Consider also עָרֹר עָרֹר 'Rase, rase!' in Ps. 137⁷; הֵב הֵב 'Give, give!' in Prov. 30¹⁵; אָבִי אָבִי 'the veil that veils' in Isa. 25⁷; אָבִי אָבִי 'My father, my father!' in 2 Kings 2¹² and 13¹⁴; and רֹאשִׁי רֹאשִׁי 'My head, my head!' in 2 Kings 4¹⁹. See also Jer. 4¹⁹ 15¹².

Obs. 1. The line is placed before—or at least near—a repeated word or words, even when a *different* form has been introduced between the identical terms. Examples occur in Ps. 57² חֲנִי אֱלֹהִים חֲנִי

'Have mercy on me, O God, have mercy on me'; Ps. 75² אֱלֹהִים הוֹדִינוּ לְךָ 'We give thanks unto thee, O God, we give thanks'; Ps. 76⁸ אָתָּה נֹרָא 'אָתָּה רָאוּךְ מַיִם אֱלֹהִים רָאוּךְ מַיִם'; Ps. 77¹⁷ 'The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee'; Ps. 115¹ לֹא לָנוּ יְהוָה לֹא לָנוּ 'Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us'; Ps. 92¹⁰ בִּי הִנֵּה אֹיְבֶיךָ יִהְיֶה בִּי הִנֵּה אֹיְבֶיךָ יִאֲבְדוּ 'For lo thine enemies, O Lord, for lo thine enemies shall perish'; Ps. 93³ נִשְׂאוּ נְהָרוֹת קוֹלָם יְהוָה נִשְׂאוּ נְהָרוֹת 'The rivers have lifted up, O Lord, the rivers have lifted up their voice'; Ps. 94³ עַד-מָתַי רִשְׁעִים יְהוָה עַד-מָתַי רִשְׁעִים 'How long shall the wicked, O Lord, how long shall the wicked exult?'. See also Prov. 31⁴ אֵל לְמַלְכִּים לְמוֹאֵל אֵל לְמַלְכִּים.

No line, however, is inserted in Cant. 1¹⁵ 'Behold, thou art fair, my love; behold, thou art fair.'

Obs. 2.—As וְהִדְרֶךָ 'and thy majesty,' at the end of Ps. 45⁴, is immediately repeated at the beginning of v.⁵, the line cannot, of course, be inserted *between* the forms,* but it is placed after the second.

Obs. 3.—Exceptional cases in which immediate repetition of the same word or expression is *not* certified by the presence of the line, are Ex. 3⁴ 'Moses, Moses'; 2 Kings 9⁴ 'the young man, the young man'; Isa. 38¹⁹ 'the living, the living'; Jer. 2¹³ 'cisterns, cisterns'; Jer. 7⁴ 'The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord'; Ps. 93¹ 'he is clothed, he is clothed'; Ezek. 21¹⁵ 'a sword, a sword'; 21³², 'Overturn, overturn, overturn'; Zech. 2¹⁰ 'Ho, ho!' Jer. 22²⁹ 'Earth, earth, earth.' See also Jer. 15³ 46²⁰, Ps. 115^{12, 14}.

* See the rule on p. 39.

Obs. 4.—The line is commonly absent from cases in which immediate repetition of the same form idiomatically indicates either (a) *distribution*, as in Ex. 36⁴ אִישׁ אִישׁ ‘each man,’ Gen. 32¹⁷ עֶדְרָ לְבֶדּוּ ‘each flock by itself,’ 2 Chron. 13¹¹ ‘every morning and every evening,’ Deut. 14²² ‘each year’; or (b) *intensity*, as in the common expression Gen. 7¹⁹, Num. 14⁷ מְאֹד מְאֹד ‘very very’; Deut. 16²⁰ צֶדֶק צֶדֶק ‘nothing but justice’; Deut. 2²⁷ ‘only by the road’; Deut. 28⁴³ (two instances), Josh. 4^{2, 4}.

The line, however, appears in 2 Kings 3¹⁶ נָבִים | נָבִים ‘ditches, ditches,’ *i.e.* full of ditches.

Obs. 5.—The line is very rarely placed *before* the repeated words, as in Ps. 96¹³ ‘for he comes, for he comes.’ But when Maqqeph joins them, the pointer, of course, cannot but precede, as in Isa. 18⁷ גּוֹי | קוֹרְקוֹ.

(5) The note-line is sometimes—not frequently—inserted between * adjacent words which are *similar* in form, to assure the reader that both are genuine elements in the text. Such pairs of words may either (a) belong to the same root, or (b) bear only an outward resemblance, their origin being wholly different.

(a) Illustrations of cognate forms in combination, marked by the line, are הַזֶּר | הַזֶּר ‘the sojourner that sojourns,’ Lev. 19³⁴ and 20²; וּבְנֵי בְנֵיהֶם | וּבְנֵי בְנֵיהֶם ‘their children and the children of their children,’ 2 Kings 17⁴¹; יְמִימָה | כְּיָמִים in Judg. 11⁴⁰ 21¹⁹, 1 Sam. 2¹⁹ and elsewhere; similarly לְיָמִים | יָמִים in 2 Sam. 14²⁶; כְּיָמִים | לְיָמִים in 2 Chron. 21¹⁹; לְיָוִם | לְיָוִם in Esth. 3⁷;

* Rarely *before*, as in 1 Kings 18⁴⁵, Jer. 25³; or *after*, as in Deut. 2⁷, Judg. 18¹⁰, Prov. 8¹³.

בְּיוֹם in 2 Chron. 30²¹; בְּפַעַם in Judg. 20³¹; לָכֵה in Josh. 8³³, Ezek. 47¹² 48²¹; מָוֶה in 1 Sam. 9¹⁰; בָּנִים in Deut. 5⁴; שׁוֹרֵר in 2 Chron. 30¹⁰. Excellent double illustrations are שׁוֹרֵר in Isa. 21², and שְׁמַע in Ezek. 3²⁷.

See also 1 Sam. 3¹⁰ 7¹⁴ 20²⁵ 27¹, 2 Sam. 24³, 1 Kings 20²⁵ (twice).

Unmarked pairs of cognates are שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה in 2 Chron. 24⁵ and לְיוֹם בְּיוֹם in v.¹¹; see also Deut. 15²⁰, 1 Chron. 12²².

(b) Instances of adjacent words, similar in form or sound, but different in their origin and meaning, and thus marked by the line, are הוּי in Isa. 1⁴; וְאֵנִי in Ps. 40¹⁸ and 70⁶; לָעַת in 2 Sam. 11¹; וְיִמָּאֵן in Gen. 39⁸; נָעוּל followed by נָעוּל in Cant. 4¹²; וְאִם-תִּעֲזָרוּ in Cant. 2⁷ and again in 3⁵; similarly וְיִמָּה-תִּעֲזָרוּ in 8⁴. See also Deut. 1²⁸, Ps. 18⁸ 38¹³, Jer. 6¹¹ etc.

Note.—In *familiar combinations* such as that of the emphasising infinitive with its cognate finite verb, *the omission of the line is the rule*, as the mark seemed unnecessary; thus Ex. 3⁷ רָאָה רְאִיתִי; Lev. 27¹⁹ יִנָּאֵל, etc.

In some cases, however, the scribe has inserted the line, when he deemed this needful, as in Gen. 17¹³ הַמּוֹל; Isa. 24³ הַבּוֹן; See also Num. 15³¹. In 1 Sam. 27¹, the line *follows* the form.

The want of uniformity in such cases clearly proves that the insertion or omission of the sign

was frequently determined by the taste or opinion of the scribe.* At some points its insertion might seem expedient, or even necessary; in other places, where it did not seem required, it was omitted. Thus, Deut. 7²⁶ presents a double illustration of the emphasising combination of the absolute infinitive with its finite verb, the construction being noted in both instances by the line יִשְׁקֶץ | הִשְׁקִצְנוּ | וְהָעַב | הִתְעַבְנוּ; yet the line is *not* inserted in similar cases previously occurring in this book, such as 4²⁶ (two instances) 6¹⁷, and even in the same chapter (viz. in Deut. 7^{2, 18}).

(c) With cases of adjacent similars marked by the line may fitly be classed the few instances of *alliteration* which are likewise noted by the pointer, as in Ps. 127¹ שָׁמַר | שְׁמִירָה | שְׁמִירָה; 137³ שָׁמַר | שְׁמִירָה | שְׁמִירָה.

(6) The pointer sometimes calls attention to 'conflate readings' of the same word, in which the second form is usually to be preferred.

Illustrations are נָאָה | נָאָה in Prov. 8¹³ (where the pointer follows the forms); יִשְׁשׁוּ | יִשְׁשׁוּ in Ps. 40¹⁷ (repeated in 70⁵), Ex. 38⁹, 1 Sam. 4¹⁸, Ps. 10¹⁴, Jer. 6¹¹. But there is no line with the conflates in Job 20¹⁷, Jer. 10²⁵.

See also the remarks at p. 51.

(7) The line may also be placed with the first or the second of two similar *expressions* in immediate proximity. These, as in cases just indicated, are sometimes really 'conflates,' but other instances are intentional repeti-

* See subsequent remarks on this subject, at p. 112 ff.

tions, slightly varied in the second form, for the sake of rhetorical effect.

Examples are הָלַלְתָּ אֶת־יְהוָה | הָלַלְתָּ in Ps. 148¹, and הָלַלְתָּ | הָלַלְתָּ in Ps. 150¹. In Job 13^{13, 14}, the latter verse begins in almost the same form as that in which the former ends, thus עָלִי מָה : עַל־מָה; hence the notifying line is placed after the second expression.* Ezek. 3^{5, 6} runs thus: 'Not unto a people deep of lip and heavy of tongue art thou sent, [but] unto the house of Israel. Not unto many peoples, deep of lip and heavy of tongue, whose words thou canst not understand.' The line at the beginning of v.⁶ calls attention to the similarity between the words there and those at the opening of v.⁵.

See also Hos. 9⁷.

(8) The pointer frequently marks *superfluities*, which may be regarded in different ways.

A. As regards their *form*, superfluities may consist of a single letter, or a single word, or several words. It is advisable to consider these classes separately.

(a) We shall first consider some cases of *single letters intruded* into the text.

In Prov. 3²⁸, the line post-fixed † to the form לִרְעִי, as well as the marginal Qerî, ‡ calls attention to the letter י as an intrusion,—for the *singular* ('to thy friend'), not the plural, is the correct reading. In Josh. 19¹¹, the pointer prefixed to לַיָּמָה ('to seaward') marks the ל as superfluous. In Ps. 10², the line after יִתְפַּשֵּׁי marks the plural form, as well as הִיטְבוּ at the close, as irregular; the omission of the

* See p. 24.

† See p. 29.

‡ See p. 13.

concluding ו in both cases would restore these words to harmony with the context, which exhibits the nouns and verbs in the *singular*. In 2 Chron. 23¹⁰, the line has been inserted to show that the conjunction before וְאִישׁ is needless. Similarly, the line inserted in the opening words of Ps. 43¹, viz. שְׁפֹטֵנִי וְיִקְרָאֵנִי וְאֶעֱנֶהוּ Ps. 91¹⁵, is noted as an enfeebling superfluity. A double illustration is presented in 1 Chron. 21¹², where ל before לְמִשְׁנֶה, and ו in וּדְבַר are both marked as disturbing additions. In Lev. 27¹⁰, the line obviously marks the following מ as a misleading dittogram from the word preceding.

For cases in which the Article is marked as superfluous, see p. 65.

(b) We shall next consider cases in which a *single word* is marked as a foreign element.

The negative in the expression בָּטָרָם לֹא יָבוֹא ('before it comes'), Zeph. 2², is rightly marked as needless and disturbing; in Esth. 8¹¹, similarly, the line prefixed to אִשָּׁר properly indicates that this is superfluous; while, in 2 Sam. 7²⁴, the second לֵךְ is justly noted as an unnecessary repetition. In 1 Sam. 12²¹ כִּי is marked as a disturbing element which should be removed; * the same word is similarly marked as needless in Ex. 12^{15.19}, 1 Sam. 20⁹ 25³⁴, 2 Sam. 12¹⁸ (first occurrence) 14¹⁷, Jer. 4²², Ps. 96⁵, 1 Chron. 21¹⁸. In the unique phrase יוֹם הַמַּחֲרֵת וּבֹל יוֹם הַמַּחֲרֵת

* The word is not represented in any of the Ancient Versions.

in Num. 11³², the second word is rightly indicated as unnecessary (see the correct phrase in Ex. 32⁶, Num. 17^{6, 23}, Jonah 4⁷ etc., where יום does not appear); in Jer. 40⁷, the second הַפְקִיד is noted as superfluous; similarly, in Josh. 19⁴⁷, the first אֹתָהּ is pointed out as needless. In Zech. 17¹⁷ עֹר occurs no less than four times; at the beginning, where it is marked by the line, it certainly seems superfluous, yet it may really belong to the end of the preceding verse, as testified by the Septuagint. In Num. 10³², it is enough that וְהָיָה should be used at the beginning of the verse; its second occurrence is thus properly marked as superfluous; the pointer is also placed with the same form, to mark it as unnecessary, in Isa. 4³ 7¹⁸ 11¹¹.^{*} Other instances of superfluous words, marked as such by the pointer, are אֲנַחְנוּ in Gen. 42¹³; לִבְנוּ in Gen. 47²⁹; פֶּתַח (with the double line †) in Num. 4²⁶ (see the correct expression in Ex. 35¹⁷ 39⁴⁰); אֲנִי in Ex. 6⁵; נְתַנִּים in Num. 8¹⁹; לָהֶם in Num. 32³³; אֵלַי in Isa. 31⁴; אִשְׁרָ in Eccles. 8¹⁴; לָךְ in 1 Chron. 17²²; לְאַמֵּר in Gen. 42²² and 2 Sam. 2¹; שְׂאֵל in 1 Sam. 29³ and 2 Sam. 3⁸; בָּל in Lev. 4⁷.

(c) We shall next give instances in which *two or more words together* are marked as superfluous. Such unnecessary insertions are especially frequent in Jeremiah.

In Gen. 16³, according to some editors,‡ אִשְׁתּ אַבְרָם ('the wife of Abram') is preceded by the line, to show that the expression is really a needless

* The form, however, is not indicated as superfluous in Isa. 7^{21, 22, 23} etc., though it really *is* needless in these passages. See, further, pp. 51 and 105 ff.

† See pp. 4 and 28.

‡ See pp. 3 and 105.

repetition of an explanation already given in v.¹. In Lev. 14⁶ הַחַיָּה הַצֹּפֹר הַחַיָּה is noted as unnecessary, seeing that 'the living bird' has already been mentioned at the beginning of the verse; and similarly, in v.²⁸, the words אִשָּׁר עַל-כַּפּוֹ are marked as an unnecessary repetition from the preceding verse. In Gen. 30³², the pointer marks the beginning of a needless insertion, viz. נָקָד וּמָלוּא וְכָל-שֵׁה, which only disturbs the flow of the sentence. In Job 32⁶, the line marks 'Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite' as an unnecessary expression, repeated from v.². In 1 Chron. 2³, the explanation that Er was 'the firstborn of Judah,' is marked as really needless (but not marked in the parallel passage, Gen. 38⁷). In 1 Sam. 10¹⁸, the pointer similarly shows that the words 'to the children of Israel' may be omitted. Jer. 38⁴ contains two excellent illustrations: both בָּעִיר הַזֹּאת and הָאִישׁ הַהוּא are marked as superfluous; moreover, in v.²⁰ בְּקוֹל יְהוָה is indicated as a redundant insertion. Similarly, in Zech. 3⁸ הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל is pointed out as a superfluity, after the expression has been already employed in v.¹; in 2 Sam. 1⁶ הַמִּנְיָר לוֹ is noted as a repetition from the preceding verse; in Jer. 32⁸ אִשָּׁר בְּאַרְצָן בְּנִימָן is marked as an unnecessary explanation regarding Anathoth; and in Jer. 1¹⁰ הַיּוֹם הַהוּא is likewise indicated as superfluous. See also Ps. 92¹⁰ (three words needlessly repeated), 93³ (two words unnecessarily repeated); 2 Chron. 18³ (unnecessary explanation that Ahab was 'the King of Israel'), and v.⁷ (where the words 'to Jehoshaphat' might be omitted: see also 1 Kings 22⁸). See likewise Josh. 22³², Jer. 32^{36, 43}.

A notable illustration under this head, marked by the line, is the familiar formula כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה , which appears with special frequency in Isaiah: thus 37⁶ 45¹⁴ (cf. end of v.¹³) 49⁸ (cf. v.⁷) and ²⁵ 50¹ 65⁸ (cf. v.⁷) and ¹³ 66¹²: see also 2 Kings 3¹⁷ 7¹. Even more frequently is the insertion noted in Jeremiah: see 2⁵ 9²² (cf. v.²¹) 10² (cf. v.¹) 17⁵ 19¹¹ 22^{3, 6, 30} (cf. vv.¹ and ²) 24⁸ (cf. v.⁵) 26² 29¹⁶ 30¹⁸ 31^{6, 14, 15, 34, 36} 33¹⁰ 44³⁰ etc. etc. In Ezekiel, the similar formula $\text{כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יְהוּדָה}$ is similarly marked: see 5⁷ (cf. v.⁵) 13^{18, 20} 14^{4, 6} 17³ 20³⁹ 24⁶ 28² 29³ 34² 36⁶ 37⁹ 39¹⁷. Examination of these passages clearly shows that the additions are superfluous, and interrupt the even flow of the discourse, so that they may, on the warrant of the pointer, be safely omitted without affecting the sense or dignity of the passages in which they now appear.

B. When we further consider the *origin and character* of the superfluities, these may be conveniently arranged in different classes.

(a) Some are readily recognisable as natural but *inadvertent repetitions* of what is already in the text.

Thus, in Ps. 86⁹, the conjunction before the second of the two verbs $\text{יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה יְבָאֵי}$ seems to be marked as a needless repetition of the last letter in the first; in 1 Sam. 24¹⁰ הַיּוֹם is rightly enclosed within a pair of note-lines to show that it is unnecessary, after 'this day' has previously been given at the beginning of the verse; in Ps. 96¹³ בְּיָ בָא is marked as needlessly repeated; in Josh. 19⁴⁷, it is certainly enough that אֶתְּחַהֶּה should be used once, so that the

line is rightly placed with the first, to mark it as superfluous. See also 1 Kings 3^{12, 26}.

(b) Other additions must be regarded as *intentional insertions*.* These, again, form various categories: thus—

1. Explanatory words or clauses were designedly added to the text by a copyist who did not consider the original reading sufficiently clear.

In Gen. 27¹, it is related of Isaac that 'he called for Esau, his elder son'; the last two words in the Hebrew text (בְּנוֹ הַזָּקֵן) are properly noted as superfluous. In Gen. 47²⁹, where it is recorded of Jacob that 'he called for his son, for Joseph,' לְבִנִּי is rightly marked as unnecessary. 1 Sam. 29³ makes mention of 'David, the servant of Saul the king of Israel,' but 'Saul' is marked as an unnecessary explanation. In Gen. 37²², 'Reuben' is marked as needlessly repeated from the previous verse; in Josh. 22³², the line indicates that there is no necessity for repeating, from the preceding verse, the explanation that Phinehas was 'the son of Eleazar the priest'; in Isa. 45¹ לְבוֹרִישׁ is marked as an explanatory addition to the preceding word, 'to his anointed.'† See another excellent illustration in Gen. 19¹⁴, where mention is made of Lot's sons-in-law; also 2 Chron. 18³ 23¹⁴.

* J. Olshausen (*Lehrbuch*, § 43), indeed, followed by Ortenberg (in *Stade's Zeitschrift*, vii. 301) and Prätorius (in *Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, liii. 683) held that the *main* purpose of 'Paseq' is to indicate interpolations. It will be admitted, however, that this opinion was rather hastily formed.

† In these last two instances, the pointer *follows* the insertion: see p. 30 ff.

2. Closely akin to these explanatory superadditions are *synonymous words* or expressions inserted by later copyists.

Illustrations are found in Ex. 38⁹, where we find the expression לְפָאֵה נֹגֵב תִּימֵנָה ('for the region of the South, southward') marked at the proper point by the line,—though a similarly full expression in v.¹³ (לְפָאֵה קִדְמָה מִזְרָחָה 'for the region toward the East, eastward') is *not* marked by the sign; in 1 Sam. 5⁴, where וַיִּשְׁתִּי בַּפּוֹת יָדָיו occurs; in Ps. 71¹⁸, where we find עַד-זָקְנָה וַיִּשִׁיבָה 'to old age and hoary age'; in Job 21²⁸, where attention is called to the expression אֵיזָה אֶהְיֶה מְשַׁכְּנֹת רְשָׁעִים; in Isa. 5¹⁹, presenting יִהְיֶה יָמָהּ (‘let him hasten, speed’); in Ps. 40¹⁷ and 70⁵, where we find the expression וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ (‘let them rejoice, and let them be glad’). See also 2 Kings 11¹⁵, 2 Chron. 23¹⁴ ('the captains of hundreds, officers of the host'), Num. 4²⁶, 2 Kings 19⁴ ('the king of Assyria, his master'), Ex. 7¹⁹.

3. Another class of superfluities, marked by the line, is formed by *pleonasms* which have originated with the transcribers. These redundancies are easily recognised.

In Gen. 42²², Reuben is represented as having thus addressed his brethren regarding their ill treatment of Joseph, 'Did I not say unto you [saying], Sin not against the youth?' The line before לְאִמֶּר here rightly marks it as superfluous. Further, in 1 Kings 19⁷ and Isa. 11¹¹ שֵׁנִית ('again,' 'a second time') is rightly marked as superfluous after a verb which is in itself sufficient to indicate repetition. Similarly, in Gen. 21¹⁴, after the statement that 'Abraham arose early,' it is really unnecessary (cf. 2 Sam. 15²,

Zeph. 3⁷, Gen. 19², Jer. 7¹³ 35¹⁴ 44⁴ etc. etc.) to add בִּבְקֹר ('in the morning'); hence the line prefixed to this word. (The sign, however, is not found in Job 1⁵, Ex. 8¹⁶ 9¹³ etc.)

A common pleonasm, frequently marked as such, is the familiar וַיְהִי ('and it came to pass') in historical narratives: see Ezek. 8¹ 20¹, Jer. 41¹, Neh. 4^{1.10} (though the line is *not* inserted in vv. 6. 9), Judg. 19¹, 2 Sam. 1² etc.

Similarly, in prophetic passages, the connecting formula וַיְהִי ('and it shall come to pass') is frequently marked by the pointer, to show that it may safely be omitted without injury to grammar or sense: see Isa. 2² 7¹⁸ (but the line is omitted in vv. 21. 22. 23) 10^{20. 27} 11¹¹ 23¹⁷, Ezek. 38^{10. 18} etc.

Here perhaps may be placed Jer. 28³ and Num. 11²⁰, in which 'two years' and 'a month,' respectively, are followed by 'days.'

See also Ex. 6⁵, Lev. 10³, Num. 10³², 1 Sam. 28¹², 2 Sam. 3²¹, 1 Kings 1³², Jer. 32^{36. 43} 38²⁰ 52³, Amos 1².

4. *Conflate readings* present another class of superfluities. Here the correct reading—or what is supposed to be more correct—usually follows, but sometimes precedes the faulty form; and the pointer is at hand to warn the reader of difficulty in the text.

Examples occur in 1 Sam. 9¹⁰, where the former of the two words לֵכָה | לֵכָה may safely be omitted as a corruption of the second; in 1 Sam. 4¹⁸, where, instead of the first two forms in the troublesome expression בִּיַּד הַשָּׁעַר | בָּעֵד | יַד הַשָּׁעַר, we must simply put בִּיַּד as the correct reading; in Ex. 22²⁴, where we read

אִם־כֶּסֶף ׀ תִּלְוֶה אֶת־עַמִּי אֶת־הָעֲנִי ('If thou lendest money [to my people] to the distressed'), presenting the closing expression as the more correct form of what immediately precedes.*

To this category also belongs Deut. 17⁸, which runs thus in the English Version: 'If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke [being], matters of controversy within thy gates, then thou shalt . . . come unto the priests the Levites, and unto the judge . . . and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment.' An attentive reader of even this translation will perceive the difficulty that, while one could expect the controversy to be waged between one *person* and another, we find it represented as lying between one *thing* and another. Yet this is a fair rendering of the troublesome clause in the Massoretic text, which is the following:—

בֵּי־דָם ׀ לְדָם בֵּי־דִין לְדִין וּבֵין נִגַע לְנִגַע דְּבַר־יָבוֹת

To obtain the correct reading and rendering, let it be observed that the first and second clauses are similar in form, and that the first significantly has the pointer within it; yet neither side presents the correct reading, which, however, may be very simply obtained through careful examination of both, as they are conflate forms. The truth is that all the leading forms here are *active participles*, and signify *persons*; moreover, as the first two sets of expressions are equally traceable to one and the same

* It will be observed that the pointer has been inserted too early in this sentence: see p. 33.

genuine reading, this will be obtained only after discarding both of the former and substituting the latter. The restored text then runs thus—

בֵּין־דָּוָן לְדָוָן וּבֵין נֹגֵעַ לְנֹגֵעַ דְּבָרֵי רִיבוֹת

which may be rendered, ‘between one contender and another, and between one smiter and another, stating [their] causes.’

On the other hand, the *second* is the incorrect form—therefore to be discarded—in the following combinations: 2 Sam. 14¹⁹ אִם־אֵשׁ (marked by the note-line succeeding); Ps. 144¹ לְדָוָד וּבֵין־דָּוָן.

See also Ex. 30³⁴, Judg. 6², 1 Sam. 27¹, Ps. 10⁹.

5. Other instances, however, of a more striking character occasionally occur. We sometimes find a sudden transition to another subject, after the discourse has been smoothly flowing on, so that it becomes difficult to perceive why the interruption was made. The line may mark the turning-point to the new topic.

In Josh. 13²¹, the latter portion of the verse, commencing with the words ‘and the princes of Midian,’ shows slight internal connection with what precedes: the line appears where the addition begins.

Jer. 12¹⁻⁴ contains an address to the Lord by the prophet, who reverently requests an answer to the ever-recurring problem regarding the prosperity of the wicked; but before the case has been even briefly stated, the discourse is abruptly broken off, and we are face to face with an address to the prophet which can hardly be regarded as a reply from the Lord. The sudden transition, at the beginning of v.⁵, is marked by the line.

The fragmentary character of Jer. 29¹⁶, as well as its want of proper connection with the preceding verse, seems to be indicated by the line at the beginning.

See also Gen. 37², Ps. 40⁶ 42⁵, Zech. 3⁹ 6¹⁵ 9¹¹ 13⁹.

(9) The note-line often indicates where *omissions* have been made in the course of transcription.* For the sake of convenience, these omissions may be simply classified.

(a) Omission of a *single letter* is not uncommon.

In Jer. 7⁹, the line in the expression הַנֶּזֶב ׀ רָצָה calls attention to the omission of the conjunction ׀ before the second word: see the succeeding infinitives, to all of which the conjunction is prefixed. In Num. 4¹⁹, the opening words וְזאת ׀ עֲשֵׂה are marked to show the inadvertent omission of ה from the beginning of the verb (which should be the future תַּעֲשֶׂה); the disappearance was most natural after the occurrence of the same letter at the end of the demonstrative pronoun preceding. In the expression עֲלֵכֶן ׀ קָרָא שְׁמָהּ Judg. 15¹⁹, the note-line similarly indicates the omission of ׀ (quite naturally after the same letter preceding) from the verb-form, which should therefore be וַיִּקְרָא; the restored text will then be rendered, 'therefore its name was called.' In Gen. 35⁵, the unique construct form הַתָּה ('fear'), to which the line is prefixed, is obviously a mutilated reading which

* A glimpse of this important principle was obtained by Dr. Wickes, who says in a footnote on p. 129 of his *Treatise on Prose Accents*, 'Attention may be drawn to Judg. 16², 1 Sam. 16⁷, and 2 Chron. 21¹⁹, where Legarmeh seems to indicate defective grammatical construction, as Paseq in 2 Kings 25⁴.'

has arisen through the omission of the initial מ from מִחֲתָת. In Ps. 74¹⁸, the line after חָרַף indicates the omission, from the end of this form, of the pronoun-affix of the second person; as shown by the succeeding parallel member, we must read חָרַפְךָ, and render 'hath reproached thee.' In Ps. 78⁶, the line following יִדְעוּ shows the omission there of the pronoun-affix ׁם, which is required to complete the sense ('that they might know [them]'). In Isa. 63¹, the line in the expression בָּא מִיָּדָה ׀ calls attention to the omission of the article, which naturally took place after the preceding ה.* In Ps. 119⁶⁹, the line after לֵב indicates that it stands for לֵבִי, so that the expression may be rendered 'with my whole heart,' as has been done by the Septuagint translator.

(b) Omission of *single words* is somewhat common.

In Ps. 33¹² (the only verse in this Psalm which contains the pointer), attention is obviously called to the omission of אֲשֶׁר, the relative. In Ps. 45¹³, the line appears at a point where a verb must be supplied: 'the daughter of Tyre [shall come] with a gift.' In Deut. 3²⁰, from between the words יְהוָה ׀ לְאַחֲיֵיכֶם, as shown by the presence of the line, there has taken place the omission of אֲלֵהֵיכֶם, which would most naturally be neglected on account of its similarity to the word following. In Josh. 6²⁴, the line before הַבָּסֶף marks the omission there of כָּלִי, which appears in the clause following. In Gen. 1³⁰, the *noun* רֹמֵשׁ has very naturally been omitted (where the line is inserted) before the *participle* רוֹמֵשׁ now remaining in

* For fuller illustrations of the omission of the article, see p. 64.

the text: cf. v.²⁶ and 8¹⁷. In Jer. 7¹⁴, the line calls attention to the omission of הָיָה after לְפָנֶיךָ; the full expression has previously been given in v.¹¹. From the expression וְאַתָּה נָתַן לָכֶם in Lev. 10¹⁷, the subject הָיָה has strangely been omitted at the point marked by the inserted line. In the titles of Ps. 69 and 72, the line points to the omission of ‘a psalm,’ which must be supplied to render the heading more intelligible. In Ps. 80², which consists of three parallel lines, the pointer—which is inserted too soon—indicates the omission of an imperative (perhaps another ‘hear’) after the imperfect middle clause, ‘thou that leadest Joseph like a flock.’ In Eccles. 2¹², the pointer prepares us for the omission of a verb (‘can do’), which must obviously be supplied to make sense; in 4⁸ also, a like omission of a verb is marked. In Cant. 5², the line prepares us for the subsequent omission of the participle ‘saying’; a similar omission is indicated in Isa. 18² by the line inserted at a later point. In Ezek. 3¹³, the pointer indicates that we must supply ‘I heard,’ so as to complete the sense. In Jer. 50³⁴, the line after the opening word וְאַלֵּם points to the natural omission, before it, of the similar form וְאַלֵּם ‘nevertheless,’ which must be restored to bring out the contrast between this verse and that which precedes. In Ps. 88¹⁴, the pointer indicates the omission, where it stands, of לַיְלָה (‘in the night’), which must be replaced in order to form the contrast with ‘and in the morning’ which follows. In Isa. 49⁵, the pointer obviously marks the probable omission of ‘thus’ from the opening words, ‘And now saith the Lord.’ In 2 Sam.

14³², the sign marks the probable omission, where it stands, of מַלְאָךְ ('a messenger'), which would naturally be dropped from between the now adjoining words אֵלֶיךָ לְאָמַר, which have so many letters in common. In Ps. 109²¹, the line at the opening of the verse forewarns us that הָסֵד has been omitted between עֵשָׂה אֶתִּי (as shown in the Septuagint). In Deut. 11², the pointer marks the omission of 'I speak,' as supplied in most Versions; and in 2 Sam. 24¹⁶, it notes the need of a preposition in the statement that 'the angel stretched forth his hand [over] Jerusalem.' In Jer. 19⁴ the line marks the omission of the subject, which may be either 'my people,' or 'the children of Israel.' In 2 Kings 7¹, the presence of the line in the expression בָּעֵת מָחָר notes the inadvertent omission of the resemblant verb-form תִּמְכֹּר, which must be replaced in order to complete the announcement of the prophet thus: 'About this time to-morrow [there shall be sold] a measure of fine flour for a shekel. . . .'

(c) The omission of *two or more words* is not very common; but instances do occur, and are sometimes marked.

In Gen. 3²², the *second* line (at וְעַתָּה | פָּנֶיךָ) evidently prepares us for the anacolouthon following; after 'Now therefore, lest . . . ' we should certainly expect the expression of such a practical conclusion as 'let us drive him forth,' but this is left to be inferred from the context. In Ex. 13¹⁷, the line marks a similarly incomplete sentence. Gen. 37² opens with the words, 'These are the generations of Jacob,' a formula which leads us to expect a detailed list of

his descendants, as in 10¹ 11^{10, 27} 25^{12, 19}; but as this is not given, the line is inserted to mark the blank. In 2 Kings 25⁴, the second line warns the reader of omissions, which can be supplied from the parallel account in Jer. 39⁴. In Zech. 6¹⁵, the line seems to be a premonition of the anacolouthon at the end of the verse.

See also Ps. 40⁶ 66⁷, Hos. 7¹⁶, Zech. 3⁹ 9¹¹.

(10) The pointer is sometimes employed for directing attention to single *words with some peculiarity*, or irregularity. Such a term may be (*a*) a proper name; (*b*) a rare, or unique, or poetic word; (*c*) an unusual grammatical form; or (*d*) a word of unusual or doubtful meaning.

(*a*) We shall first cite instances in which the line marks a peculiarity in the *form of a proper name*.

This is noted in Hag. 1¹², where the contracted form שְׁלֵמַיִל is for the first time found instead of the full form שְׁשַׁלְמַיִל in 1¹ and 2²³. (The short form also appears later, in 2², but is there left unmarked: see p. 107.) Similarly, in Ex. 4¹⁸, attention is called by the line to the variant form יִתְרִי, instead of יִתְרוֹ (Moses' father-in-law), as given in 3¹. In Ps. 81⁶, the mark is prefixed to the unusual form בִּיהוֹסֵף instead of בִּיֹּסֵף ('in Joseph'). In Prov. 25¹, the pointer marks the *short* form הַמֶּלֶךְ of the name of the king of Judah, Hezekiah, instead of the usual הַמֶּלֶךְ (as in 2 Kings 18⁹ etc.); on the other hand, the *longer* form הַמֶּלֶךְ is also specially noted by the line prefixed in 1 Chron. 4⁴¹.* Similarly, in Amos 1¹, the line

* See further remarks at p. 114.

before עֲיִיָּה has been placed there for the purpose of calling attention to the short form of the name of the king of Judah found here, instead of the fuller form עֲיִיָּהּ as in Isa. 1¹ and elsewhere.

Specially noteworthy is the insertion of the line to mark the *unique occurrence of a proper name*, particularly a *foreign* name. Thus, in 1 Sam. 26⁶, attention is called to Ahimelech the Hittite, whose name does not appear elsewhere; the unique occurrence also, in Jer. 40⁸, of עֵרִי (Qerî), a man's name, and in v. 14 of בְּעָלִים, a king of the Ammonites, is noted by the line; in Prov. 30¹ אֲנֹר is marked for the same reason. The name of a mountain called אֲמֹנָה is marked in Cant. 4⁸ as occurring there only. Foreign names specially marked as such, by the line, are נִכְרֶזֶה and others following in Isa. 37³⁸ and 2 Kings 19³⁷; the name of *each* of Haman's ten sons has the sign prefixed in Esth. 9^{7, 8, 9}; the mark is likewise placed before 'Persia and Media' in Esth. 1^{3, 14, 18}, and before 'India' in Esth. 8⁹; in Ezek. 47¹⁶ 'Berothah, Sibraim,' are marked, by the prefixed line, as elsewhere unknown.

See also Jer. 25²⁵.

(b) *Rare or unique occurrence of certain appellatives* is frequently marked by the line.

Thus, יָקִים in Gen. 7²³ is noted as uncommon; in Josh. 13³ and Judg. 3³, attention is called to the peculiar designation סֶרְנֵי פְּלִשְׁתִּים ('lords of the Philistines'); in Cant. 4¹⁴ פָּרָבִם ('saffron'?) is marked as unique, and several words similarly in Esth. 1⁶. For the same reason we find the sign with גִּלְמֵי in Ps.

139¹⁶, with קְמִישׁוֹנִים in Prov. 24³¹, with סַר in Job 13²⁷, with עֲלוֹקָה in Prov. 30¹⁵.

See also Josh. 20⁹, 2 Chron. 26¹⁵.

(c) The pointer is often associated with *unusual grammatical forms*.

Examples appear in Gen. 1²⁹, where, instead of the Qal participle זָרַע, we should certainly expect the Hiphil participle מְזַרֵּעַ, as in vv. 11. 12; in Ps. 9¹⁴, where הִנְנִי is found instead of the usual הִנָּנִי; in Prov. 9⁷, where יִסַּר unexpectedly occurs instead of the more correct Piel participle מְיַסֵּר; in Isa. 4⁴, where רָחֵן is marked as less likely than יִרְחֵן to be the proper form; in Gen. 15¹, Esth. 3¹, where the form אָחַר is pointed out as less common than אַחֲרֵי; in Ex. 8⁵, where the singular form לְמַתִּי is noted as less correct than the simple מַתִּי; in Josh. 3⁴, where the adjectival form רָחוֹק is indicated as less likely than the noun-form רוֹחֵק to be correct; in Ruth 1¹³, where the unexpected form לָהֶן is noted as actually found instead of the correct (masculine) לָהֶם; in Num. 11¹⁵ and Deut. 5²⁴, showing the abnormal אָתָּה, for which אַתָּה should be substituted; in Ps. 41³, with יִשְׁמְרֵהוּ, instead of which יִשְׁמְרֵנִי should rather be expected; in Hag. 2¹², where the Aramaising form הֵן ('if') occurs, instead of the more classical אִם, which actually appears in the next verse. In Deut. 14²⁸, attention is called to the long form מִקְצֵה ('at the end of'), with the same meaning as the short form מִקֵּץ in 15¹.

See also Lev. 13⁵⁵, Ps. 62⁴. 11 65¹⁰ 76⁶ 77¹⁸, Jer. 2²⁴, Job 16¹², Esth. 1⁵, Deut. 28⁵⁷.

(d) The line marks *words bearing an unusual meaning or application* in the following passages:—

In Gen. 13¹⁶ אִשָּׁר must either be held to signify 'so that,' or is superfluous; in Gen. 2⁵ שִׁיחַ bears the singular sense of 'bush' or 'shrub'; in Prov. 24¹⁶ שִׁבַּע signifies 'seven times,' but this meaning would more commonly be conveyed by the fuller expression שִׁבַּע פְּעָמִים; in Deut. 7¹² עָקֵב is marked as bearing the exceptional sense of 'if,' though generally signifying 'because'; in Ezek. 5¹ חֶרֶב, though usually meaning 'a sword,' is noted as bearing the unusual sense of 'a knife'; in 2 Chron. 5¹, 'the holy things of David' is with good reason marked as a singular expression; in Gen. 23¹⁷ וַיָּקָם has received the line at its side to mark the strange use of the verb, though the form is really a corruption of וַיִּקֶּן 'and it was purchased'; in Prov. 8²¹, the pointer beside שׁ calls attention to the special meaning that must be attached to this term, which is commonly affirmed to be 'substance,' *i.e.* wealth; in Num. 4⁹ בָּנָה has received the line to mark its unique application to denote a covering for the ark, as elsewhere it means an article of wearing apparel. In like manner, attention is called by the line in 2 Kings 20⁵ to the unexpected designation of King Hezekiah, in the Divine message, as בְּנִיר עַמִּי 'prince of my people'; and in 1 Kings 11³⁴, where King Solomon is called נִשְׂיָא 'prince.'

See also 2 Kings 4¹³, Ps. 69¹⁶, Prov. 6⁹, Neh. 2⁶.

(c) The line sometimes also marks *words of doubtful meaning*; in such cases, however, the forms may really prove to be questionable readings.

Thus, in 1 Chron. 15²⁷ מְכַרְבֵּל, marked by the sign, is generally supposed to mean 'clothed'; but it may

be an obscured form of a familiar term. Again, in 1 Chron. 8³⁸ בְּכֹרוֹ is generally regarded as the name of a person ('Bocheru'); but the line preceding indicates a doubt whether it should not rather be read בְּכֹרִי 'his firstborn,' and thus be viewed as explicative of the person previously named. In Prov. 30⁸, the line prefixed to the second of the first three words evidently means that this may otherwise be pointed וְדַבֵּר or וְדִבֵּר, and thus translated 'and one who speaks,' or 'and utterance,' either of which renderings would be as suitable as that indicated by the Massoretes.

See also Isa. 49²¹, 1 Chron. 12⁴⁰.

(f) The pointer may call attention to *unique forms* (ἄπαξ λεγόμενα), whose genuineness or signification is thereby questioned.

Ps. 68¹⁷ opens with the expression לִמָּהּ | תִּרְצֹדֶנָּה, in which the line is prefixed to the verb-form in order to show that this is absolutely unparalleled by any other from the same 'root,'—if root there be; the meaning of the word is quite uncertain, though Gesenius renders it 'observe insidiously.' Frequently, however, it is read תִּרְקֹדֶנָּה ('leap,' or 'skip'), but a more simple and suitable emendation is תִּרְעֹדֶנָּה ('tremble' for fear).

Ps. 72¹⁶, which somewhat interrupts the even flow of the poem, begins with the words יְהִי בִפְתִיבֵר | בְּאֶרֶץ, showing the pointer-line post-fixed* to a compound expression difficult to explain, especially because the supposed noun פִּתְּיָר occurs nowhere else in Scripture,

* See p. 30, footnote.

and no satisfactory meaning has yet been attached to the form, though it has variously been alleged to signify 'abundance,' or 'a handful.'

In Ps. 89⁹, which begins a direct address to the Almighty, theré first appears a pointer that may merely be an anticipation of the second; this is placed beside a unique form. After the question, 'Who is like unto thee?' there follows the remarkable expression יְהִי כְּיָהּ, the first word of which occurs nowhere else, and is really difficult to explain, though some commentators render the words by 'a strong one [is] Jah.'

In Ps. 55¹⁶, the opening word, marked by the line, is יְשִׁימוֹת, which some expositors read as יְשִׁימוֹת and explain as 'desolations'; but the Qerî is יְשִׁיאַ מָוֶת 'let death deceive [them],' while a bolder rendering would be יְשִׁיגֵם מָוֶת 'let death overtake them.'

Deut. 27⁹ contains the expression וְשָׁמַע, showing the pointer beside the opening word, which occurs here only. Perhaps this is merely an aural error of transcription for הִשְׁקַט which appears elsewhere (Isa. 7⁴ etc.) in similar circumstances, bearing the meaning ('be quiet') that should most probably be attached to the form here.

The opening words of Ps. 55²³ are usually rendered, 'Cast upon the Lord thy burden.' But the Hebrew term יְהִבֶּךָ, forming the object in this brief sentence, appears nowhere else in Scripture, and is of wholly uncertain origin, so that its meaning can only be conjectured. The early scribe who here inserted the line has thereby recorded his perplexity with this word, which some later interpreters have supposed to mean

‘grief.’ The form still awaits a satisfactory explanation. In 1 Kings 19⁸, attention is called by the line to the unique form אֲכִלָּה (with the article prefixed), for which אָכַל ‘food,’ would rather have been expected.

See also Gen. 38²⁴, Josh. 20⁹, Judg. 6², Job 19³, Jer. 11¹⁶, Ezek. 17⁹.

(11) The pointer is frequently employed to mark peculiar or *abnormal constructions in grammar*. Such divergences are various, but they may be conveniently classified.

(a) Irregularities in the *use of the article* are sometimes noted by the line.

(a) The *absence* of the article may be marked at points where it should normally appear.

Thus, in 2 Kings 20¹³, attention is called to the construction in אֵת | שְׁמֵן הַטּוֹב; in Ps. 146⁶, we are invited to consider עֲשֶׂה | שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ, all the more because the article *is* used before the object immediately following (viz. ‘the sea’); in Isa. 63¹, we are called to note בָּא | מִי זֶה, where the omission of the article from the last term may be regarded as an instance of haplography, due to the influence of the preceding demonstrative (see similar instances in Job 38² 42³); in Deut. 31³, the sign distinctly notes the article as absent in the expression הוּא | עֶבֶר לַפָּנִיךְ; while its presence, on the other hand, is marked with equal distinctness in vv. 6. 8, where we find the expression הוּא | הַחֵלֶד לַפָּנִיךְ; in Lev. 11²⁷ וְכָל | הַחַיָּה הַלֵּד is all the more noteworthy because similar expressions in the preceding verses, and following in the same verse, *have* the article; in 2 Sam. 20³, the line calls attention to

the double omission of the article from the two consecutive defined nouns in the expression 'the ten women, the concubines.' Highly instructive is the expression $\text{הָאִישׁ} \mid \text{לְבָשׁ הַבְּדִים}$ ('the man clothed with the linen garments') found in Ezek. 9¹¹ and 10², with which must be compared $\text{הָאִישׁ הַלְבָּשׁ הַבְּדִים}$, the fuller construction previously given in 9³. The absence of the article is similarly noted in $\text{שְׁלֹשָׁה} \mid \text{קָנִי מִנֹּרָה}$ ('three branches of the lampstand') Ex. 25³² and 37¹⁸; and in the unvarying expression $\text{אֵת} \mid \text{אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד}$ ('the tent of tryst') in Ex. 31⁷ etc. The line prefixed to the defective expression בְּלֵילָה הוּא in Gen. 32²³ marks it as notable, and invites comparison with the full construction בְּלֵילָה הָהוּא given in the verse immediately preceding.

(β) At other times, the pointer calls attention to the *abnormal presence of the article*.

Thus, in 2 Kings 25⁴ and Zech. 1⁸, the sign has been placed before הַלַּיְלָה , which properly signifies 'to-night' (or 'this night'), but must in both passages—as the context shows—be rendered 'by night,' *i.e.* לַיְלָה . In Jer. 38⁶, the irregular attachment of the article to a construct noun is noted in the expression $\text{מִלְכִּיְהוּ} \mid \text{הַבּוֹר}$ 'the cistern-prison of Malchiah,' and a like irregularity is marked in Ezek. 21²⁷, where we find $\text{הַקְּסָם} \mid \text{יְרוּשָׁלַם}$ 'the divination of Jerusalem.' In Isa. 63¹¹, the line is prefixed to הַמַּעֲלֵם 'he who brought them up,' a Hiphil participle to which a pronominal suffix as well as the article is attached; the same accumulation is again marked, anticipatively, in Ps. 81¹¹, where we find the form הַמַּעֲלֶךְ 'he

who brought thee up.' The line likewise calls attention, in Num. 7^{7,8}, to the definite forms of expression וְאֵת אַרְבַּע הָעֲגֵלֹת and וְאֵת שְׁנֵי הָעֲגֵלֹת ('the two waggons,' 'and the four waggons'), instead of which the context rather leads us to expect indefinite expressions, *without* the article and the accusative sign ('two waggons,' 'and four waggons'); and again, in Num. 35¹⁴, to אֵת שְׁלֹשׁ הָעָרִים, instead of which we certainly rather expect an indefinite expression (viz. 'three cities'). In Prov. 30¹⁹, the presence of the article in הַנֶּשֶׁךְ 'the eagle,' is marked as abnormal when the form is compared with like nouns, in succeeding clauses, *without* the article; similarly, in Ps. 65¹⁴, הַצֵּאֵן is noted as not in accordance with the corresponding noun, which wants the article, in the second parallel member of the verse.

See other instances in 1 Sam. 11⁷, Ps. 104²⁵ 106⁴⁸ (latter half, two cases) 129⁸, Jer. 31³⁹ 48²⁷.

(b) The pointer sometimes marks *unusual constructions of nouns*. Such instances may advantageously be classified. Thus—

(a) Attention is called to cases in which a noun is found in the *absolute state*, when the construct might rather have been expected.

In Neh. 2¹² we find אֲנָשִׁים וּמַעֲט 'a few men,' instead of אֲנָשֵׁי מַעֲט, or אֲנָשִׁים מַעֲטִים; and in 1 Sam. 10³ we find שְׁלֹשָׁה גִּדִּים 'three kids,' though the construct form שְׁלֹשֶׁת occurs in the next clause.

(β) On the other hand, uncommon uses of the *construct state* may be noted by the line.

Instances are שֹׁכְבֵי קֶבֶר 'lying [in] the grave,' Ps. 88⁶; עֹבְרֵי בְּעֵמֶק הַבָּכָא 'those passing through the valley of Baca,' Ps. 84⁷; חֲמִשָּׁה חִלְקֵי אֲבָנִים 'five smooth stones,' 1 Sam. 17⁴⁰. See also Zech. 8¹⁷, Ps. 127², 1 Kings 2³¹ ('blood shed causelessly').

(γ) Circumlocutions for expressing the genitival idea by means of לְ, may be indicated by the line.

Examples are קֶרֶן לְעַמּוֹ 'the horn of his people,' Ps. 148¹⁴; לְיְהוָה כֹּהֲנִים 'priests of Jehovah,' 2 Chron. 26¹⁷; לְיְהוָה יְשַׁבֵּת 'the sabbath of Jehovah,' Deut. 5¹⁴.

(δ) Abnormal *insertion of a word between a construct noun and its genitive* may be noted by the pointer.

Cases are מְקוֹם-שָׁם קֶבֶר 'a place of burial there,' Ezek. 39¹¹; and the *second* clause in Ex. 26^{2, 8}, which must be rendered 'and the breadth of the second curtain [was] four cubits.'

(ε) The line may mark a noun placed absolutely and without inflection at the beginning of its own clause, sometimes for the sake of emphasis.

Examples are בָּסָף in Ex. 21³²; אֹרֶךְ in Ezek. 40⁴⁷; תְּשׁוּאוֹת in Isa. 22²; שְׁמִים in Ps. 89³.

(ζ) Singular for plural.

Thus בְּבֵיתִי instead of בְּבֵיתַי 'in the houses of,' 2 Kings 17²⁹.

(η) A suffixed noun, instead of the absolute form followed by a 'dative.'

In Ps. 115⁷ 'their hands' is noted as an irregular construction for 'hands [are] to them,' as in vv.^{5, 6}

(But the sign is not repeated at the similarly irregular form following ['their feet'].)

(c) The line sometimes calls attention to *abnormal arrangement of attributives*, which should succeed their principals instead of being placed in front.

Illustrations are מֹשֶׁה | זֶה 'this Moses,' Ex. 32^{1, 23}; לַחֲמֹנִי | זֶה 'this bread of ours,' Josh. 9¹²; אֱלֹהִים | זֶה 'this God,' Ps. 48¹⁵. See also 1 Chron. 26²⁶.

(d) The omission of the relative sign אֲשֶׁר is sometimes marked by the line.

Instances are הָעָם | בָּחַר 'the people [whom] he chose,' Ps. 33¹²; בַּיּוֹם | הַזֶּה 'on the day [when] he delivered,' Ps. 18¹; תִּבְחַר | אֲשֶׁר 'blessed [is he whom] thou dost choose,' Ps. 65⁵. See also Ps. 74².

(e) The line may mark *want of agreement* between subject and predicate.

In Ps. 55²², attention is called to the plural predicate הָלְקִי, whose subject ('his mouth') is singular,* and in Ps. 66⁴ similarly to the formal incongruity in כָּל-הָאָרֶץ | יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָּךְ 'all the earth shall worship thee.'

(f) The line frequently calls attention to *noteworthy constructions of verbs*. Such cases may conveniently be classified thus—

(a) The sign often marks an *unusual regimen of a verb* in relation to its object, especially when the completion of its essential idea is effected by means of a preposition not ordinarily thus employed.

* But perhaps the genuine reading is הָלֵק (adj.) 'smooth.'

In Ps. 18¹, we are called to observe the construction לַיהוָה דָּבַר, as the preposition commonly employed is אֶל; in v. 7, note is made of the simple accusative in the expression אֶקְרָא יְהוָה, instead of the indirect government by means of אֶל; and in v. 51, the exceptional construction עָשָׂה חֶסֶד לְמִשְׁיחוֹ (instead of the normal connection by means of the preposition עִם) is similarly marked. In Ps. 31¹⁵, attention is called to the unusual construction עָלַיךְ בְּטַחְתִּי 'upon thee did I trust'; the preposition אֶל appears in v. 7, but the connection of the verb with its object is normally affected by means of בִּי. In Ps. 137⁶, note is made of the abnormal regimen in the expression תִּדְבֹק לְשׁוֹנִי לְחֻבִּי 'let my tongue cleave to my palate,' where the preposition בִּי would rather have been expected; and of the construction זְכֹר יְהוָה לְבָנֵי אֲדוֹם 'remember, O Lord, the children of Edom,' in v. 7, where the direct accusative could have been used instead. Other instances, in which a preposition is abnormally introduced, particularly between a verb and its object, are in 1 Sam. 1¹¹ תִּרְאֶה בָּעֵינֶי אִמָּתֶךָ 'thou wilt behold the distress of thine handmaid'; in Ps. 146⁷ עֲשֵׂה מִשְׁפָּט לְעֹשִׂיקִים 'executing judgment for oppressed ones'; and in v. 9 יְהוָה שֹׁמֵר אֶת־גֵּרִים 'the Lord preserveth strangers.' See also Josh. 1¹⁵, Ps. 40¹⁰, 138², Eccles. 6², Jer. 46²⁸, Ezek. 18²⁰.

On the other hand, the *absence* of a connecting preposition, between a verb and its object, may be marked by the line, as in Deut. 3²⁷ ('go up [to] the top of Pisgah'), Ezek. 11¹³ ('and I cried [with] a loud voice'; compare 1 Sam. 28¹², Neh. 9⁴ etc., where בִּי is used). See also Ps. 2¹², 18⁷.

Another unusual construction is noted in Jer. 18²⁰ זָכַרְתִּי עֲמָדִי 'remember that I stood' (*lit.* 'remember my standing'). See also Deut. 28⁵⁵, 2 Sam. 20¹⁰.

(β) The line may note the *uninflected use of a verb*, in the form of the *absolute infinitive*, when a finite form would be expected in less vivid and impassioned or more finished style.

See Esth. 9¹⁶, where we read: 'But the rest of the Jews that were in the royal provinces gathered together and stood (נִקְהָלוּ וַעֲמָדוּ) for their lives . . .' Isa. 22¹³ 'But behold joy and gladness, slaughtering of oxen (הִרְגוּ בַּבָּקָר) and slaying of sheep. . . .' See also Ps. 126⁶, Jer. 32⁴⁴ 35¹⁵ (double line).

(γ) The pointer may mark the employment of a *participle* and a *pronoun*, instead of an ordinary finite form of the verb.

Illustrations are Num. 10²⁰ נִסְעִים אֲנַחְנוּ ('we are journeying'); Deut. 5²² אֲנַחְנוּ לְשִׁמְעַתְּ אִם-יִסְפִּים ('if we are again to hear'); 2 Kings 10⁶ אִם . . . אִתָּם יִשְׁמָעִים ('if ye hearken').

(g) The pointer often calls attention to unusual forms or uses of *conjunctions*.

Thus, in 2 Sam. 23¹⁰ עַד כִּי ('until') is marked as being less common than עַד אֲשֶׁר; in 1 Sam. 5⁹ אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר is noted as abnormally joined (instead of אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר) with a finite verb; in Job 4¹⁹ אַף is marked as employed for the fuller כִּי אַף ('how much less'); in Num. 10³¹ כִּי is pointed out as an unnecessary amplification of כִּי ('because'); in Ps. 90² בְּטָרָם is marked as followed by the perfect, instead of the more usual

imperfect, even in narrating what is past (see Gen. 37¹⁸, Ex. 1¹⁹, Jer. 1⁵ *twice*).

(h) The pointer frequently marks an abrupt *change of construction* during the course of a sentence.

In Mal. 2¹¹, after the feminine has been employed, in the first part of the verse, in describing the wickedness of apostate Judah, a sudden change to the masculine is marked in the latter half, commencing כִּי הִלַּל יְהוּדָה. In Ps. 10², after beginning has been made with the singular, there comes a transition to the plural, in the forms וַתִּפְּשׂוּ and הִשְׁבִּי: the line has been inserted into the text to note the change. Similarly, in Ps. 32⁹, after the singular has been used in the preceding verses, note is made, by the pointer, of transition to the plural in the expression אֲלֹתֵיהֶם. In Gen. 14², after the preposition אֵת has been prefixed to the names of the first *two* kings, it is omitted—and the inserted line calls attention to the fact—before the names of the remainder. In the middle of Ex. 12¹⁵, the line gives forewarning of a sudden change in construction: ‘for, every one that eateth leaven,—that soul shall be cut off’: a similar example appears in v.¹⁹. Lev. 11²⁷ presents a more lengthy illustration: ‘And everything that goeth . . .—whosoever toucheth their carcase shall be unclean.’ The line in Ex. 34¹⁵ marks striking changes of construction,—first, from the second person singular ‘thou,’ next to the third person plural ‘they,’ and then to the indefinite third person singular ‘one.’ The pointer at the beginning of Deut. 4⁵ marks a rapid and remarkable transition from the second person singular to the second person

plural: **לְמַדְתִּי אִתְּכֶם** : **רֵאָה** 'See [thou], I have taught you.' Change from the second person to the third is expressly noted by the pointer at the opening of Ps. 135⁹ 'He sent signs and wonders into the midst of thee, O Egypt, upon Pharaoh and all his servants.' In Ex. 35²², the line inserted in the expression **כֹּל נְרִיב לִב** notes the sudden occurrence of the singular form (instead of **נְרִיבֵי**) in the midst of plurals. In Jer. 46¹⁶, change from the singular of the imperative to the plural of the cohortative is presented in the expression **קִימָה וְנִשְׁוֹבָה** (but probably the first of these forms should be **נִקְימָה**).

See also Gen. 37²⁰, Lev. 10⁶, Ps. 5⁷, Jer. 13¹⁰ 30¹⁵.

(i) The insertion of the line may be prompted by a desire for a more suitable arrangement of verses.

In Ps. 96¹³, the first two words at the beginning, viz. 'before the Lord,' cut off by the line which follows, certainly find a more fitting position at the end of the preceding verse. (But the line may likewise call attention to the remarkable repetition immediately following, viz. 'for he comes, for he comes.'*) See also Zech. 1¹⁷.

(12) The note-line is frequently inserted to point out the *order of words as remarkable at least*, if not questionable. The cases in which a peculiar arrangement of the members in a sentence is thus noted may naturally be disposed in two different classes.

(a) Certain words may purposely be placed in unusual positions for the sake of emphasis.

* See p. 48.

Thus, in Neh. 2², the subject is marked by the line as intentionally placed before its predicate, for emphasis: 'Why is *thy face* sad, seeing that thou art not ill?' In Job 14¹⁹, the object is noted by the sign as purposely put first, to give it special prominence: '[Even] *stones* the waters wear away.' Lev. 11²⁶, which treats of unclean animals that were not to be eaten, distinguishes them as 'not cleaving the *hoof*, and not chewing the *cud*': these objects are placed in the beginning of their respective clauses, and have the line inserted beside them to certify that the words are thereby intentionally emphasised. Similarly, the line in 2 Kings 5¹¹ seems to have been inserted where it now appears, to assure us that the unusual arrangement of the members in the sentence was made for the purpose of producing special emphasis: 'Surely he will come out to *me*!'

(b) More numerous are instances in which the line marks *inadvertent displacement, by an early transcriber, of words* from their natural order in the sentence.

In Ruth 4¹¹, the sign calls attention to the order in which Jacob's two wives are mentioned, viz. 'Rachel and Leah' (not 'Leah and Rachel'); and in the same book, 1², the names of Naomi's sons are similarly marked as given in the order, 'Mahlon and Chilion,' whereas, in 4⁹, the order is 'Chilion and Mahlon.' In 2 Sam. 3¹⁸, we are called by the presence of the pointer to observe the unusual order of the words 'David my servant,' because the normal arrangement (see 7⁵, 8, 26 14¹⁹, 20 etc.) is 'my servant David'; and in the same book, 4⁹, the order of the

names of those who murdered Ishbosheth is specially noted as 'Rechab and Baanah,' because, in v.², mention had first been made of Baanah, then of Rechab. Similarly, in Jer. 14¹⁶, the prefixed line calls attention to the order of the words, 'the famine and the sword,' inasmuch as vv.^{12, 13, 15} had previously presented these in reverse order. In Judg. 21²² אֵלֵינוּ is properly marked as placed rather late in the sentence, for it should immediately follow יָבֹאוּ; and in Ps. 49¹¹ כִּי should not begin but come second in the sentence, so that this may be read, 'He seeth that wise men die.' In Ps. 28¹ 'my rock' should not be separated from יְהוָה by אֶקְרָא, but should come between these words, where the line appears. Josh. 19⁵¹ shows בְּגוֹרֹל ('by lot') with a double note-line * as placed rather late within its own proposition, where it should occupy a position nearer the verb. In Ex. 29²⁷, the line, though inserted prematurely,† points to the fact that the relative clause אֲשֶׁר הוּנַף comes too late; it should immediately follow its antecedent, 'the breast of the wave-offering.' In Ps. 18⁵⁰ יְהוָה is marked as appearing rather late within its own proposition (see the parallel in 2 Sam. 22⁵⁰, where it rightly comes earlier); for the same reason אֶרְנִי in Ps. 86⁸, יְהוָה in Ps. 108⁴, רַעְהוּ in Ps. 101⁵, and נַפְשִׁי in Ps. 142⁸ have the line prefixed to them. The line in Ps. 119¹⁵⁶, after רַבִּים, shows that this word, as the predicate, should stand first in the verse; and the sign in Isa. 10¹⁴ indicates that יָדִי ('my hand') should be placed earlier, immediately after its verb. In 1 Sam. 14⁴⁷ פָּכִיב is noted as

* See p. 28.

† See p. 25.

appearing too early; similarly, in Isa. 4⁵ יוֹמָם is marked as introduced too soon, and thus disturbing the close connection between 'cloud and smoke.' In Ezek. 26¹⁵, and again in 38¹⁴, the interrogative הֲלֹא is pointed out as awkwardly suspended at the beginning of its own clause, while its verb, which should follow as soon as possible after, is not introduced till near the end of the sentence. Isa. 66²⁰ presents an excellent illustration of perplexity caused through transposition of words and clauses; the introduction of the lines is obviously intended to assist in reducing the whole to better order.

See also Gen. 17¹⁴, Lev. 20⁵, Num. 9¹⁰ 31³⁰ (cf. the proper order in v. 47), Jer. 42⁶, Ezek. 24¹⁷, Mic. 5⁴, Ps. 3¹ 24^{7.9} 39¹³ 69⁷ 116¹, 1 Chron. 2²⁵ (cf. the normal order in 9⁵), Neh. 8¹⁷, 2 Sam. 6².

(13) The line frequently points to a strange expression or *startling statement*, calculated to raise doubt as to its accuracy.* This sense of difficulty apparently led to the insertion of the line, which may accordingly be regarded, in such cases, as essentially a query introduced by an observant scribe.

In Judg. 1⁷, we find the sign at the remarkable statement that 'seventy kings' (שִׁבְעִים מְלָכִים), with their thumbs and their great toes cut off, gathered their meat under his table; the number seems incredible,—even though we should take the 'kings' to be but petty chiefs,—and we should probably read

* For the present, we have to consider mainly the question of *fact*. At a later stage (p. 78), attention will be turned to the removal of such difficulties by means of textual emendations.

‘seven.’ In Josh. 5⁶, the mark is placed at the statement, ‘For forty years (שְׁנָה | אַרְבָּעִים) the children of Israel walked in the wilderness’; obviously, the number is merely approximate, and the correct reading probably is כְּאַרְבָּעִים (‘nearly forty’). A querying line is similarly placed after the statement, in 1 Chron. 29²³, that ‘Solomon sat on the throne of Jehovah’ (הוּא יָהוָה). In Judg. 20³³, the mark is placed at the beginning, where we read that ‘all’ the men of Israel rose up out of their place to set themselves in battle-array; this statement is somewhat surprising in view of what is immediately added, that ‘the ambush of Israel’ simultaneously arose from their place, for attack. Similarly, in Lev. 4⁷, after it had been ordained that the officiating priest is to put ‘some of the bullock’s blood’ (vv. 5, 7) on the horns of the altar of incense, it is added that he should pour out ‘all the blood’ at the foot of the altar of burnt-offering: by the insertion of the line, attention is reasonably directed to כָּל as a strange reading. In 1 Sam. 18¹⁰, we read that ‘an evil spirit of God’ (רָעָה | רִיחַ אֱלֹהִים) fell upon Saul; the insertion of the double note-line is of course substantially a query by the scribe. In Ex. 18¹², where we read that Jethro brought a burnt-offering and sacrifices, it is added that Aaron came, ‘and all the elders of Israel,’ to eat bread with Moses’ father-in-law before God; but an observant transcriber has inserted the interrogatory line at ‘all.’ In Jer. 7¹⁶ the line obviously calls attention to what is certainly a remarkable prohibition; the prophet is actually forbidden by the Lord to intercede on behalf of

the people. Similarly, when a like utterance is repeated later, in 11¹⁴, the line is inserted at the equally remarkable reason given for forbidding intercession, 'because I will not hear in the time that they cry.'

See also Deut. 28⁶⁸, 1 Sam. 14³⁶ 22¹⁸, 2 Sam. 13²⁹, 1 Kings 10¹⁰, Jer. 12¹⁴.

(14) The insertion of the line was frequently prompted by a spirit of reverence in the scribe, who thereby noted *anthropopathic expressions*, or any phrase that might seem to detract from the Divine dignity. The sign may therefore be regarded, in some instances, as meant to remind the reader that such expressions must not be interpreted literally.

Thus, in Ps. 13², the line has been inserted in the earnest but not strictly proper question of the distressed writer addressed to the Lord, 'How long wilt thou withdraw * thy face from me?' Similarly, in Ps. 27⁰, which begins, 'Withdraw not thy face from me,' the expression is marked as anthropopathic; in Deut. 16¹¹, containing the words, 'Thou shalt rejoice before the face of the Lord thy God,' and again in v.¹⁶, which contains the command, 'Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the face of the Lord thy God, the words signifying 'face' are noted by the line; the mark is also found in the command, Deut. 14²³, 'Thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God . . . the tithe of thy corn . . .' Notably also the line appears, Deut. 23¹⁵, in the reason assigned for the command to the Israelites

* See the author's *Studies in Hebrew Synonyms*, p. 71.

that they should keep the camp clean, viz. that the Lord 'walketh' * in the midst of it.

Again, in Num. 10³⁵, at the words, 'Arise, O Lord,' the line appears to suggest that such language is almost too familiar. Specially remarkable is Ps. 44²⁴, containing the intensely earnest cry, 'Awake! why sleepest thou, O Lord?' and showing the line beside *both* verbs, to mark the feeling in the mind of the inserting scribe that such language was not strictly admissible. Similarly, in Isa. 37¹⁷, the line calls attention to the impassioned utterance of Hezekiah in his prayer for heavenly help, 'Incline thine ear, O Lord, and hear; open thine eyes and see.' † Exception is further taken, through the insertion of the line, to the description in Ps. 78⁶⁵, that 'the Lord awaked as one that had been asleep'; and in 1 Kings 19⁴ to the words of the wearied and weak Elijah, 'It is enough now, O Lord; take away my life,' as unbecoming and hardly reverent even in the mouth of an honoured prophet.

See also Ex. 34⁶, Num. 6^{25. 26}.

(15) Specially frequent is the insertion of the line by later transcribers to mark difficulties caused by a predecessor's *substitution of a questionable reading*. For the original word, he had inadvertently written another resembling it in form or sound, but differing in sense.

The principle on which the later scribes introduced

* This anthropopathism, however, is not marked in Gen. 3⁸, where the Lord is described as 'walking in the garden.' See subsequent remarks on this subject, p. 112.

† Only some editions exhibit the line in Ps. 86¹, at the words, 'Incline thine ear, O Lord.'

the sign was simple. No attempt was made on their part to amend the passage; they practically left it as it was. But if a single word was found intractable, it was marked as lying under doubt. Reverence for the sacred text would doubtless suggest this conservative course.

These suspected readings vary much in character. Some difficulties can be solved very simply: the restoration of a single letter may suffice to give the reading we require. In other cases, more than one letter must be altered ere a satisfactory solution is obtained. More complicated instances involve the correction of several words. Yet all such emendations, even when conjectural, must be strictly regulated by sound principles, derived by induction, after careful observation and experience of similar changes proved to have taken place elsewhere in the Hebrew Scriptures. But after all there will remain some passages unsolved,—perhaps insolvable.*

Simple illustrations will now be given of instances in which the correction is easy. Let it be observed, however, that the following emendations are effected without much regard to the testimony of the Septuagint or other ancient Versions, inasmuch as many of the difficulties noted by the line had already crept into the Hebrew text before these translations were made.†

Gen. 29¹³, according to the Massoretic text, informs us that when Laban heard the ‘tidings’ (שִׁמְעָה) of Jacob, his sister’s son, who had just arrived from

* See p. 90.

† See p. 20.

Canaan, that he ran to greet him. The line after שָׁמַע, however, indicates the doubt of the scribe regarding this reading; and his suspicion is confirmed by the Septuagint, in which *ὄνομα* points to שֵׁם as the correct term, so that the expression originally was 'the name of Jacob.'

Lev. 16¹³ forms part of the directions regarding the mode in which Aaron was to enter the holy place on the Great Day of Atonement: 'he shall put the incense upon the fire [in the censer] before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat.' For the first time in this chapter, the pointer-line appears in front of the expression 'the cloud of incense,' for which the phrase occurring in the Hebrew received text is עֶנַן הַקְּטֹרֶת. But why is the line here at all? Because the intelligent scribe who inserted it felt confident that עֶנַן is inappropriate, and that the true reading rather is something similar, viz. עָשָׁן 'smoke.'

The Massoretic text in Ps. 84¹² represents Jehovah as a 'sun (שֶׁשֶׁשׁ) and shield,' but the combination of figures is somewhat incongruous. This has been perceived by the scribe who inserted the line after 'sun,' which he felt to be a textual difficulty. The ingenious suggestion of Houbigant, that we should read שָׁמַר ('preserver,' or 'guard'), forms the best solution of the difficulty. If both predicates be taken as participles, the resultant rendering becomes, 'The Lord is a protector and preserver.'

The line at the beginning of Josh. 6¹⁹, in the expression וְכָל־כֶּסֶף וְכָל־כֶּסֶף, 'and all silver,' was evidently introduced by a scribe who thought that the first

word should rather be **וּכְלִי**, as in the context immediately following; the opening words should therefore be, 'and vessels of silver.' *

Deut. 12¹⁵ gives directions regulating the slaughter of animals which were to be used merely as human food, and not offered in sacrifice, away from the central altar. 'Thou mayest slay, and eat flesh.' The corresponding Hebrew, actually found in the Massoretic text, is **וַאֲכַלְתָּ בֶּשָׂר** | **תִּזְבַּח**; but it will be observed that a scribe has with good reason inserted the note-line after the first verb, which should rather be **תִּזְבַּח**, inasmuch as **זָבַח** properly signifies to slay animals *for sacrifice* (see Ex. 3¹⁸ 5^{3. 8. 17} etc.), whereas **טָבַח** signifies to slaughter animals for use merely as human food (see Gen. 43¹⁶, Ex. 21³⁷, 1 Sam. 25¹¹ etc.).

Ezra 4² records that the aliens who had been settled in the land of Israel, after the mass of the Hebrews had been carried to Babylon, came to Zerubbabel after the Return from the Captivity and desired to share in the worship of Israel's God. 'Like you,' they said, 'we seek your God, and to him have we been doing sacrifice.' In the Massoretic text, the Hebrew corresponding to the last clause is **וְלֹא** | **אֲנַחְנוּ זֹבָחִים**, but the marginal note rightly calls us to read **וְלֹא** instead of the first word. It will further be observed, however, that an early scribe had already noted the textual difficulty, and inserted the usual signal-line. †

* Reference has already been made to this passage in another connection: see p. 21.

† On the coincidence of the Qeri with the note-line, see p. 13.

In Ps. 54, containing 9 verses, the pointer appears only in v.⁵, and there at the form זָרִים ('strangers'), which has obviously been regarded by the observant scribe as too mild a term to suit the context; the similarly sounded צָרִים ('adversaries') must be restored, as more appropriate.

In Gen. 18²¹, Jehovah is represented as saying concerning the wickedness of the people in Sodom, 'I will go down, that I may see whether they have done wholly (עָשׂוּ כִּלְאֵה) according to the cry of it, that is come unto me.' It will be perceived that the pointer has been inserted before 'wholly,' which certainly demands a somewhat unusual construction in its favour, if it be the genuine reading. But it is more probable, as has already been suggested, that the correct reading is כֻּלָּם ('all of them'); and this may have been the view of the scribe who introduced the sign.

In Gen. 19⁹ (the first place in this chapter, containing 38 verses, where the line appears,—the only other instance being v.¹⁴, where another textual difficulty is noted), the mark is placed before נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶהֱ לֵאלֹהֵי, the short and sharp command addressed to Lot by the wicked Sodomites who assailed him at his own door. It has long been perceived that these two words, taken in their usual meaning, 'Come thither,' present a contradiction: the insertion of the pointer here records the difficulty felt by the scribe. Instead of imposing on וַיֵּשׁ a meaning directly opposed to what it bears elsewhere, and then rendering the two words by 'Be off!' (as in the Septuagint ἀπόστα

ἐκεῖ), it certainly suits the context better to amend הָלֵאָהּ into הָלֵם, and then render the expression 'Come here!'

In Jer. 44⁹ (the first point at which the line appears in this chapter), the mark is prefixed to the expression מְלֻכֵּי יְהוּדָה ('the kings of Judah,' *plural*); but in the next clause we find נְשֵׁי (‘his wives,’* the pronominal suffix being *singular*). The difference between these two expressions, in number, might well lead us to conclude that an early scribe had inadvertently added ' to the Hebrew term for 'king,' through the influence of the initial letter in the next word 'Judah.' With the observant scribe who inserted the line, we may safely assume that the correct reading is מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה ('the king of Judah').

In Ruth 2²¹, the opening words וַיֵּם אֲנִי אָמַר, given as reported to Naomi by her daughter-in-law, and describing what Boaz had done, are noted by the Hebrew scribe as doubtful, for the usual meaning of the first two words, combined, is 'Even if'; the construction is certainly unusual. But by changing the first word into אָף we obtain an excellent and appropriate statement, 'He actually said!' (See Neh. 9¹⁸, Gen. 3¹.)

In Ps. 22, the line does not appear till v. 16, where it is significantly prefixed to כֹּחִי ('my strength'). The suspicions of the scribe who placed it there have been confirmed by the judgment of J. Olshausen, Ewald, and others. These have pointed out that parallelism requires us to restore the form to חֲבִי

* Not 'their wives,' as given in the English Versions.

(‘my palate’), so that the first part of the verse may run thus—

‘My palate is dried like a potsherd,
And my tongue cleaveth to my jaws.’*

In Hos. 9¹, after the opening words, ‘Rejoice not, O Israel,’ the pointer fitly introduces an expression which, as it stands in the Massoretic text, does not accord with ordinary constructions in Hebrew grammar. The words אֶל-נֵיִל בְּעַמִּים have been rendered ‘for joy, like [other] peoples,’ but the whole result is unsatisfactory. Guidance to a better reading, however, is afforded by the Septuagint † μηδὲ εὐφραίνου, which at once gives us וְאֶל-תִּגֵּל, forming a satisfactory parallel to the beginning of the verse. The following context further seems to warrant the emendation of בְּעַמִּים into בְּעַמִּי, so that we may render the verse, thus far, as follows:—

‘Rejoice not, O Israel,
Nor exult like my people.’

In Ps. 104⁸, which forms one of several verses declaring Jehovah’s absolute mastery over the waters of the mighty deep, one is certainly startled on finding the statement, ‘they go down to the place which thou didst found (יִסְדָּתָם) for them.’ Hence the old scribe appropriately placed the pointer before the suspected term. A little consideration leads us to think that instead of the verb laid under suspicion,

* For other emendations necessary in this verse, see *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Psalms*.

† See also the Syriac and Vulgate.

we should read one of similar sound, viz. *יֵעָרַת* ('thou hast appointed').

Ex. 16²⁹ records Moses' reproof of the Israelites who transgressed the Divine command, and went out to seek for manna though none was to be found. One of the injunctions impressed anew on the wayward and unbelieving ones runs thus: 'Sit ye each one where he is.' The received Hebrew text is *יֹשְׁבוּ אִישׁ תַּחְתּוֹ*; but the scribe who inserted the pointer evidently thought, with good reason, that the verb actually in the text should rather be *יִשְׁבּוּ* 'Rest ye'; and certainly the dominant idea in the whole episode is the Divine command to *rest* on the seventh day.

Ps. 109²⁸ presents an excellent instance in which the pointer precisely locates a textual difficulty that can easily be solved by observing the laws of parallelism. A strict translation of the whole verse, as given by the Massoretes, is the following:—

‘ Let *them* curse,
But *thou* shalt bless;
They arose and were ashamed,
But thy servant shall rejoice.’

That the harmony of the whole is obviously broken by the third line, was perceived by the old transcriber who introduced the pointer thus, *קָמוּ אִישׁ יָבִישׁוּ*. By a very simple emendation we obtain the true reading, viz. *קָמוּ יָבִישׁוּ*, which in English becomes—

‘ Those who rise against me shall be ashamed.’

When this change is made in the third line, the

demands of parallelism are satisfied, and the whole verse runs smoothly.

2 Chron. 2⁹ relates, in part, Solomon's proposals to the King of Tyre, with the view of obtaining workmen and material for building the Temple in Jerusalem. Among other things, the Jewish monarch promises to give to the foreign artisans what is described in the Massoretic text as חֲטִיִּים מִבּוֹת; this expression, however, as we see from the insertion of the pointer, has naturally been regarded as unintelligible. It cannot fairly, on grammatical grounds, be rendered 'beaten wheat,' as in the English Version; nor is the difficulty much lessened by proposing to read חֲטִי מִבּוֹת. But guidance is given in the parallel passage, 1 Kings 5²⁵, where the reading is חֲטִיִּים מִבְּלֶת, in which the second word is doubtless contracted from מִבְּלֶת, so that the expression may be rendered 'wheat [as] food.' This satisfies the requirements of the passage.

Deut. 28²⁵, according to the Massoretic text, may be rendered thus: 'The Lord shall deliver thee [to be] smitten before thine enemies; by one way shalt thou go out against him, but in seven ways shalt thou flee before him.' When we observe that the pointer has been inserted before נִגַּף ('smitten'), and when we further remember that the dominant idea here is the craven *flight* of the Hebrews before their enemies, we conclude that the intelligent scribe who inserted the line thought the true reading was a similar form, viz. נִדָּף ('driven away'), which should unhesitatingly be restored.

Ps. 37¹⁴ opens with a strange expression, rightly

marked with the pointer, **חָרַב** | **פָּתְחוּ רִשְׁעֵיכֶם**, which is commonly translated, 'The wicked have drawn the sword.' But this is a forced rendering of the verb, which really means 'opened.' The proper verb to use in such a connection—if 'drawn' be the true reading—is **שָׁלַף** (see Num. 22^{23, 31}, Josh. 5¹³, Judg. 8¹⁰ 20^{2, 15, 17, 46} etc.); but as it is hardly probable that this form has been exchanged for that which now appears in the Massoretic text, it is likely that we should read **חָרְרוּ**, which bears a suitable meaning ('sharpened'), and might naturally be displaced by the received reading, which it resembles in sound and form.

Ps. 78²¹ immediately follows a brief description of Israel's discontent and unbelief in the wilderness, when the people did not trust the power and goodness of the Lord as ample guarantees that they would lack no good thing. 'Therefore Jehovah heard, and burst forth in wrath.' But the Massoretic text exhibits the pointer before the first verb ('heard'), which certainly may seem rather tame an expression for indicating the result, in the Divine mind, of the people's sin. This term **שָׁמַע**, therefore, has been marked as a suspected reading. But what can be suggested as more appropriate? The simplest solution appears to be that we must read **זָעַם**, which, from its similarity in sound, would very naturally be set aside, as somewhat uncommon, in favour of a more familiar word. After making restoration of the more appropriate term, the opening of the verse runs more smoothly, thus, 'Therefore the Lord was righteously indignant, and broke forth in wrath.'

In a subsequent portion of the same Psalm, the continued discontent and unbelief of the people are portrayed. Then at v.³¹ we read of the result: 'The anger of God ascended upon them.' But the Massoretic text exhibits the verb found here with the line prefixed, showing doubt in the mind of the scribe whether עָלָה was the genuine reading. Possibly the correct form is עָשָׂן 'smoked,' as in Ps. 74¹, Deut. 29¹⁹, Ps. 80⁵ etc.

In Prov. 16¹⁰, the line properly marks the first word as a questionable reading. Simply rendered, the verse would run thus: 'Divination [is] upon the lips of a king; in judgment, his mouth will not transgress.' Elsewhere, קִסָּף always signifies divination practised by sorcerers or false prophets, and of course it is utterly condemned. No good end can therefore be served by forcibly attributing to the term the sense of a 'Divine sentence' (Auth. Version) or 'oracle' (Targ.), which it cannot legitimately bear. Most probably we must amend the form, and read קִשָּׁף 'truth.' It further appears necessary to change the unsuitable verb-form יִמָּעַל, in the second part of the verse, into יִמָּעַר ('waver'). The verse will then run more smoothly thus: '[If] truth [be] upon the lips of a king, his mouth shall not waver in [pronouncing] judgment.'

Jer. 29³² records the sentence pronounced by the Lord upon the false prophet Shemaiah, who had misled the people. According to the received text, it is declared that 'he shall not have a man dwelling (or "sitting") among this people.' But a scribe, by enclosing יוֹשֵׁב within a pair of note-lines, has

indicated his hesitation in accepting this as the correct reading; and certainly the word wants force. Probably the true reading is שָׁב 'aged,' and the Divine judgment, therefore, was that no member of Shemaiah's family should live to mature years; the curse thus accords with that which was uttered long before on the sons of Eli for their sins (1 Sam. 2^{31, 32}).

Prov. 10²⁶, according to the received text, runs thus: 'As vinegar to the teeth, and as smoke to the eyes, so is the sluggard to those who send him.' But a glance at the Hebrew shows that a note-line preceding לְשֵׁנִים ('to the teeth') calls attention to the form as questionable. Most probably the observant scribe deemed that a similar form, לְלִשָּׁן ('to the tongue'), was more appropriate, and more likely to be correct.

Isa. 61³ exhibits the note-line at the beginning of the verse, where an undoubted difficulty is felt. In this passage, the Messiah lucidly sets forth the joyful work to which the Lord has appointed him—'to bring good tidings to the lowly, to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to captives, and release to prisoners; to proclaim the year of the Lord's good pleasure, and the year of vengeance of our God, to comfort all mourners.' But next (v.³) comes the expression לָשׂוּם | לְעֵבֶל צִיּוֹן, which, most naturally rendered 'to place [or 'set'] for the mourners of Zion,' is neither complete in itself, nor presents an idea appropriate to the context. Of several emendations which have been proposed, the simplest and most suitable seems to be that instead of לָשׂוּם we should read לְשַׂמַּח, and thus

obtain the rendering 'to gladden the mourners of Zion.'

See also Ex. 7^{17. 20}, Num. 11³¹, Judg. 18⁷, 1 Sam. 6¹⁸ 30²⁴, 1 Kings 1²⁵ 6²⁹, Job 27¹³, Ps. 15^{3. 4} 22³⁰ 109^{20. 25} 131^{1. 2}, Jer. 4¹³ 26¹⁵ 44¹⁴, Zech. 10⁶.

(16) Other passages marked by the line present difficulties which have not yet been solved, and may remain insolvable. The pointer may thus be regarded as inviting solutions. Some specimens of such passages will now be given. These, let it be observed, chiefly occur in the poetic portions of Scripture, though some are likewise found in prose writings, more especially the Books of Samuel.

In Ex. 17¹⁵, forming part of the account given of Amalek's discomfiture at Rephidim, we read that Moses built a memorial altar, and named it 'Jehovah Nissi.' The Hebrew is יְהוָה נִסִּי, showing the line as practically a point of interrogation inserted by a transcriber who felt in doubt. The next verse likewise awaits explanation.

In Deut. 8¹⁵, the second pointer, in particular, calls attention to an obscure expression abruptly introduced in the description of the 'great and dreadful wilderness.' The difficulty is not solved but merely lessened in ordinary Versions, which render נָחֵשׁ וְעֶקְרָב by '[wherein were] fiery serpents and scorpions.'

1 Sam. 12²¹ forms part of Samuel's exhortation to erring Israel that had madly determined to have a visible king. The insertion of the line marks the

point at which some words have been inadvertently omitted by an early transcriber. The blank is usually filled up thus: 'And turn ye not aside, for [then should ye go] after vanity.'

1 Sam. 14³⁶ introduces an episode in the history of Saul, who is here represented, according to the reading in the Massoretic text, as proposing to his followers, 'Let us go down after the Philistines by night, and plunder among them till the morning light, and we shall not leave a man among them.' An observant scribe long ago felt the difficulty of conceiving how the nocturnal *plundering* among the enemy should precede, and even be a means of killing every one; he accordingly inserted the pointer at the troublesome expression וַיִּבְזֹּזוּ בָהֶם, which has not yet been satisfactorily amended.

2 Sam. 20⁸ mainly gives details of Joab's preparations for assassinating Amasa; the brief clauses describing the arrangement of his robe and his concealment of his weapon have fallen into some confusion, and a few words still present problems which even the most skilled interpreters cannot satisfactorily solve.* The pointer has been inserted where the greatest difficulties begin.

Ps. 71²¹, brief as it is, very properly contains the pointer to mark the extreme difficulty felt by interpreters in attempting to make suitable sense of the whole. The Authorised Version runs thus—

'Thou shalt increase my greatness,
And comfort me on every side.'

* See the Commentaries of Wellhausen, Driver, H. P. Smith, Klostermann, Budde, and others.

The Revisers have given a slightly different rendering—

‘Increase thou my greatness,
And turn again and comfort me.’

But we still await a satisfactory solution of the problems associated with the four Hebrew words forming this verse.

Isa. 23¹³ has the line fittingly inserted at the beginning to mark a *series* of difficulties—textual, grammatical, and exegetical—running through this somewhat lengthy verse, the Revisers’ rendering of which is the following:—

‘Behold, the land of the Chaldæans;
This people is no more;
The Assyrian hath appointed it for the beasts of
the wilderness;
They set up their towers,
They overthrew the palaces thereof;
He made it a ruin.’

The general obscurity still remaining is only too palpable; and the large number of alternative renderings placed in the margin only prove more conclusively that the best of modern Hebraists together felt unable to understand this verse, and to make it intelligible to others.

The extreme difficulty felt in determining the true text and thus ascertaining the exact meaning of Ps. 73²⁰ may be perceived from the varied renderings of competent modern authorities; but the old scribe who long ago inserted the pointer had already thereby signified that he was baffled in his endeavour

to make good sense of the verse, particularly the latter half. The Authorised Version (which is not much changed by the Revisers) substantially runs thus—

‘As a dream when [one] awaketh,
[So], O Lord, when [thou dost] awake,
Thou shalt despise their image.’

The Septuagint rendering may be represented thus—

‘As the dream of one awakening, O Lord,
In thy city thou shalt scorn their image.’

Delitzsch gives the following rendering :—

‘Like a dream, as soon as one awaketh,
O Lord, when thou art aroused,
Thou dost rid thyself of their shadow.’

The textual difficulties, however, still await solution.

At the middle of Isa. 33¹⁴, the pointer appears in the expression יִנִּירְךָ יְיָ, which is repeated in the next clause. The difficulty perceived and noted by the old transcriber still remains ; for even after violating the normal construction of the verb, there is but small accord between the context and the resultant rendering—

‘Who among us can dwell with devouring fire ?
Who among us can dwell with eternal burnings ?’

Ps. 132¹⁷ exhibits the pointer inserted to indicate the transcriber’s inability to understand the verse, read in the light of the usual meaning attached to the several words—

‘There will I cause a horn to sprout for David,
I have prepared a lamp for mine anointed.’

There is apparent incongruity among the ideas presented in the first line especially.

Prov. 21²⁰ has justly received the line to mark the incomprehensibility of the verse in its present state. Fairly rendered, the whole assumes the following form in English:—

‘[There is] desirable treasure and oil in the abode
of a wise man,

But a prating fool [of] a man will swallow it up.’

It is not wonderful that even the most competent expositors have confessed their inability to understand this verse.

Prov. 24¹⁴, also marked by the line, is likewise difficult to understand. After an exhortation in the preceding verse to eat honey and the honeycomb, because they are good and sweet, this verse continues—

‘So, know wisdom for thyself;
If thou hast found [it], then there *is* an end,
And thy hope will not be cut off.’

Such a text might well baffle the ablest exegetes.

Zech. 3⁹, with the line at the beginning, also belongs to this class. The whole verse, as it stands, shows little internal connection with the preceding and succeeding context; and even when viewed alone, little coherence is exhibited between its several clauses. A fair translation of the whole might run thus—

‘For, behold the stone which I have put before
Joshua;
Upon one stone, seven eyes.

Behold, I engrave its graving, saith the Lord of hosts,
But I will take away the iniquity of that land in one day.'

The mention of a 'stone' is quite unexpected; but, apart from this, the later mention of 'one stone' leads us to expect some reference to another; yet there is no mention of a second. Moreover, the removal of 'the iniquity of that land' is an idea not essentially connected with any other in the context.

Ps. 9 is obviously an acrostic poem, whose consecutive verses were arranged in the order of the Hebrew alphabet. The received text, however, is incomplete. A signal break appears at v. 7, where beginning should be made with the letter **ק**; but this no longer appears as the initial of a verse. At this point, instead, we find **קִיָּאֵל**, which is followed by the significant pointer. The variety of renderings suggested shows the perplexity of even the most competent interpreters to make good sense of the verse.* The following may be taken as a fair rendering:—

'The enemy,—desolations are finished for ever,
And cities hast thou destroyed.
Their remembrance has perished.'

It is hard to discover unity of thought underlying the different clauses exhibiting such sudden transition from one subject to another.

The line at the beginning of Nah. 1¹² calls atten-

* See, among others, the Authorised English Version and its marginal rendering, the Revised English Version, the renderings of Grätz, Ewald, Hupfeld, Baethgen, etc.

tion to the series of difficulties which follow. The variety of renderings proposed by different translators reveals their perplexity. The Authorised English Version presents the following: 'Thus saith the Lord, Though [they be] quiet, and likewise many, yet thus shall they be cut down, when he shall pass through. Though I have afflicted thee, I will afflict thee no more.' In the margin, however, is given an alternative rendering of the obscure words succeeding the introductory formula: 'If [they would have been] at peace, so [should they have been] many, and so should they have been shorn, and he should have passed away.' The Revisers, in the text, thus render the verse, after the initial formula: 'Though they be in full strength, and likewise many, even so shall they be cut down, and he shall pass away. Though I have afflicted thee, I will afflict thee no more.' And for the last sentence, they propose in the margin, as an alternative rendering, 'So will I afflict thee, that I shall afflict thee no more.' The rendering of the Septuagint translator abundantly proves that he also was unable to present an acceptable representation of the Hebrew text. His version may fairly be put as follows: 'Thus saith the Lord who rules over many waters, Even thus shall they be separated, and the report of thee shall not be heard any more.' A verse so difficult to be understood might well receive the significant line.

In 2 Kings 4¹³, the opening words of Elisha to the Shunammite woman, when seeking to give her some reward, have been marked with the line as cer-

tainly peculiar,—so peculiar, indeed, as to constitute the sign a query whether the reading be correct: ‘Behold, thou hast feared for us all this fear’ (הִנֵּה חִרְרָה אֶת־כָּל־הַחִרְרָה הַזֹּאת). The verb with its cognate noun found in this passage always elsewhere indicates trembling fear for one’s self (see 1 Sam. 13⁷ 16⁴, Ezek. 26¹⁶ 32¹⁰, Gen. 27³³, 1 Kings 1⁴⁹ etc.), but not anxious concern for another’s safety or comfort, which is the sense required by the context. No solution has yet been found for the difficulty marked by the ancient scribe.

See also 1 Kings 9¹⁹ 20³⁰, Ps. 55²⁰ 77³ 113⁴, Jer. 11¹⁶ 12⁵ 31³⁹, Zech. 9¹¹.

III.

APPLICATION OF RESULTS.

9. THE LINE AS AN INDICATOR OF DIFFICULTIES IN THE TEXT.

FACTS already adduced now warrant the formulation of an important principle for criticism of the Massoretic text. This principle may be enunciated thus—

The note-line frequently indicates, more or less precisely, the spot where textual difficulties exist.

By marking suspected passages, the early transcribers have lightened our labour. It now remains for us to advance the work they began, by pursuing proper methods in the emendation of the text.

These early editors, indeed, did not note every difficulty they perceived.* Moreover, some marks have been misplaced,† while others have wholly disappeared.‡ Further, even of those which remain, we must put out of account, for our present purpose, instances in which the note-line merely indicates the repetition of a letter or a word.§ But even after making all these deductions, there remain

* See below, p. 106 f. † See p. 33. ‡ See p. 105. § See p. 37 f.

passages in which the mark demands our best attention, as locating a textual difficulty awaiting solution.

Many illustrations have already been given incidentally.* The following are additional instances, in which reasonable restoration seems possible :—

In Ex. 14¹⁰, the line before נָסַע indicates a doubt as to its genuineness; the term certainly seems too mild in its meaning ('moving,' or 'marching') to be applicable to the Egyptians who were pursuing the Israelites. Probably the true reading is נִשָּׂא 'rushing,' a comparatively rare word, similar in sound to that in the received text, which might naturally be substituted by a coypist.

In Ps. 17¹, attention is called to the strangeness of the object mentioned in the petition שְׁמֵעָה יְהוָה אֶצְדִּקְךָ, a simple rendering of which would be, 'Hear, O Jehovah, righteousness.' To 'hear righteousness,' however, is inconceivable; and failure has ever followed attempts to explain away the difficulty inseparably associated with the inappropriate object.† But when we consider the nature of the other objects in the succeeding parallel clauses, viz. 'Attend unto my cry, give ear unto my prayer,' it is easy to see that the object in the first line, which now concerns us, must be something similar (viz. a *cry* that claims to be heard), and in form will probably resemble רִנָּתִי and תַּפִּלָּתִי, the objects in the second and third lines.

* See p. 78 ff.

† The Septuagint is εἰσάκουσον, κύριε, τῆς δικαιοσύνης μου (= אֶצְדִּקְךָ); the English Version is 'Hear the right, O Lord'; Baethgen's German rendering is 'Höre, O Jahve, eine gerechte Sache.'

The reading צַעֲקָתִי 'my cry for help,' must at once commend itself as the original of which we are in search.

In Ps. 69¹⁴, for the noun תַּפִּלָּתִי, preceding the line, we must restore the verb-form אֶתְפַּלֶּתִי; and after the pointer, for אֶת רִצּוֹן read the similar forms אֶת רִצְנִי, so that the first half of the verse may be rendered thus:—'As soon as I pray unto thee, Lord, do thou graciously receive me.'

In Ps. 95, containing 11 verses, the line occurs only once, viz. in v.¹⁰, at a point in a statement which, strictly rendered, proves a rather startling utterance. The Lord is represented as speaking thus: 'Forty years did I loathe (אָקוּט) the generation, and I said, They are a people erring in heart, seeing that they do not know my ways.' One cannot think, however, of *God* as 'loathing' his chosen people, and still less continuing to do this for forty years. But by reading the marked word as a passive (אֶקוּט), and adding the demonstrative 'that' (הַהוּא) after the repointed בְּדוֹר, as testified by the Septuagint, the Latin,* and other Versions, we obtain a reasonable rendering, 'Forty years was I loathed by that generation.'

In Job 36²⁸, which treats of God's beneficent arrangements in distilling rain from heaven, an observant scribe has recorded his suspicion regarding that part of the text which represents 'man,' אָדָם as the object on which the rain is poured. It is surely safe to conclude that the correct reading is the similar form אֲדָמָה 'ground,' for which the

* Generationi illi; τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ.

other would easily be substituted. With good reason also it has been already suggested that for the succeeding word, רָב, we should read רְבִיבִים 'rain-drops.'

Num. 15³⁰, as it stands in the Massoretic text, may be rendered thus: 'But the soul that acts with a high hand, whether a native or a stranger,—he reproaches the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from the midst of his people.' It is to be observed, however, that an intelligent transcriber has marked the first verb תַּעֲשֶׂה 'acts,' as a questionable reading; and certainly this word is disappointingly vague. But if we change this term into the similar though less common תַּעֲשֶׂק 'oppresses,' which might very naturally be discarded by an earlier scribe in favour of the more familiar word, we obtain a better rendering. After this change, the first half of the verse runs thus: 'But the soul that oppresses with a high hand either a native or a stranger,—he reproaches the Lord.'

At first sight, Deut. 9²¹ reads so smoothly that one might fancy there is nothing to amend. Moses is represented as reminding the Israelites of the way in which he acted after they had made the idol-calf: 'The calf I took, and burned it in the fire, and beat it in pieces, pounding it small, to dust; and I cast the dust of it into the brook that descended out of the mountain.' But the appearance of the line in the expression וְאֶשְׂרָף אֹתוֹ בְּאֵשׁ 'and I burned it in the fire,' is an incentive to examine the passage more carefully. It then turns out that אֹתוֹ is not likely to be the pronominal accusative 'it,'

but rather עֵצוֹ, 'the wood of it,'—for what Moses burned in the fire could not be a solid mass of gold, or even the gold plating which encased the calf,*—*i.e.* the inner portion of the idol, entirely made of wood, which alone could be 'burned.' But this result leads us to venture on another emendation further on,—to change עֲפָרוֹ 'its dust' into אֲפָרוֹ 'its ashes,' the proper designation of unconsumed residuum of wood, after fire has done its work.†

In Ps. 1⁵, the line is found prefixed to the statement that 'the wicked shall not arise [or, stand up] in the judgment.' A little reflection shows that the verb יִקְמוּ has been reasonably suspected by the scribe who inserted the mark; the idea which it conveys does not commend itself as appropriate, in view of the context. It would appear that we must replace the suspected form by the Niphal יִנָּקִי, and thus obtain the declaration that 'the wicked shall not be acquitted in the judgment.'

10. UNACCOUNTABLE INSERTIONS OF THE LINE.

Though most of the instances in which the line appears in the text of the Old Testament have now been arranged under suitable categories, there yet remain certain passages in which its presence still awaits a satisfactory explanation. It may be that the insertion is due to mere inadvertency. As there are proved cases of omis-

* The metal would be *melted* in the fire.

† Similar substitution of these resemblant Hebrew forms has likewise taken place in Num. 19¹⁷, 2 Kings 23⁴.

sion,* so there may presumably be cases of insertion for which no satisfactory ground can be discovered. Good and sufficient reasons have been given for the insertion in the vast majority of passages where it occurs: that no good reason can be conceived for its presence in a small residuum of cases need excite no surprise. The following appear to be some of these instances:—

Deut. 7⁶ 'Thee hath the Lord thy God chosen to be to him a special people.' It is difficult to see why the line has been inserted at 'chosen.'

Deut. 17⁶ 'At the mouth of two witnesses, or three witnesses, shall one who is to die be put to death.' No reason appears for the presence of the line before the expression 'two witnesses.'

Deut. 19¹⁵ 'At the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall a matter be established.' Here also it is not easy to perceive why the line is inserted before 'two witnesses.'

Josh. 10⁵ 'And there assembled together and went up the five kings of the Amorites,—the king of Jerusalem, the king of Hebron,' etc. There is no apparent reason for the presence of the pointer at 'the five kings,' inasmuch as these are all distinctly specified, and there is no unusual construction requiring to be noted.

Josh. 12¹ 'Now these are the kings of the country whom the children of Israel slew. . . .' The presence of the pointer at the opening of this chapter, in a verse containing no remarkable construction or statement, remains to be explained.

* See pp. 3, 28, 105 f., 111 f.

Josh. 23¹⁰ 'One man of you shall pursue a thousand; for the Lord your God,—*he* fighteth for you.' Why the line appears before 'the Lord your God' is not obvious.

Josh. 23¹⁴ 'There hath not failed one thing of all the good things which the Lord your God hath spoken concerning you.' Neither at the expression 'of all the good things,' nor anywhere else in this verse, does there seem any reason for the presence of the pointer.

Judg. 10⁶ 'And the children of Israel again did evil in the eyes of the Lord. . . .' The line appears *twice* in this verse, first at the beginning, and then in the middle; but at neither point is there anything remarkable that seems really to require the insertion of the pointer.

Similar instances, irreducible to any of the categories previously formed,* will occasionally present themselves to an observant reader. After patient consideration, however, some reason, more or less probable, can generally be discovered for the insertion of the line, and the action of the notating scribe will thus be amply justified. The sum-total of intractable cases will then be found comparatively small.

11. WANT OF UNIFORMITY IN THE USE OF THE LINE.

After so many details have been given regarding the insertion of the note-line, it becomes necessary to make some

* See p. 34 ff.

remarks regarding its *non*-insertion. Consideration of so many different classes of instances in which it *does* appear naturally prepares us to expect it again under similar conditions. Nevertheless, such expectations are frequently disappointed: the line does *not* appear at many points where we might reasonably look for it.* The general rule which we had framed fails to apply, and numerous exceptions come into view.

Some observations, then, must now be made regarding the *non-appearance of the sign* where it might be expected. The following are the results of careful examination:—

(1) In the same passage of the Hebrew Scriptures, *different manuscripts and printed editions vary* as regards the insertion of the pointer; some copies have it, while it does not appear in others. The most probable explanation of this variation seems to be that the line was originally present at all those points where it now occurs in one copy or another, but that later scribes either inadvertently omitted the sign, or intentionally refrained from inserting a mark which they deemed unnecessary.

In Ps. 1¹, many printed editions show לוּ אִשָּׁר, but the line is absent from others; in Ps. 1², certain editions have אִם אֵי, but others want the line; in Ps. 100³, some copies exhibit the reading וְלֹא אֶנְחִי, while in others there is no intervening line; in Ps. 67.¹¹, the line is inserted after the first word, in some

* In his treatise on the Prose Accents, Wickes remarks, perhaps too strongly (p. 127), that 'the *failure* of the sign is more conspicuous than its presence.'

editions, but absent in others; in Gen. 16³, many editions present the reading שָׂרִי | אִשֶּׁת אַבְרָם, while others have no line. The same remark applies to אִשֶּׁשׁ | אִישׁ in Prov. 6²⁷, and to לְמִי אוֹי | לְמִי אֶבּוֹי in Prov. 23²⁹; אֱלֹהִי | אֱלֹהִי in Ps. 22²; צַבָּאוֹת | אֱלֹהִים in Ps. 59⁶. Most instructive, however, are the editorial notes in ordinary printed Bibles at 2 Chron. 16⁸ 21^{18, 19} and 30¹⁹, informing us that the line usually appearing there is not found in some copies.

(2) Of two parallel texts, one may have the line, while it is absent from the other.

Notably, in Ps. 18, the line is frequently inserted, whereas *it is not found anywhere throughout the parallel passage*, 2 Sam. 22. In Ps. 14⁵, the line is placed beside שָׁם, but not given in Ps. 53⁶. In Ps. 105³, the line is found, but not in the parallel verse, 1 Chron. 16¹⁰; in Ps. 96⁵, the sign appears, but not in the parallel, 1 Chron. 16²⁶; in 1 Kings 12², the line notes textual difficulties,* but it does not appear in the parallel account, 2 Chron. 10².

(3) Usage varies in relation to the *repetition of the line at successive occurrences of the same remarkable reading* in a passage. Thus—

(a) Some editors habitually repeated the line at *every recurrence* of the *same* case, throughout a whole passage, or at successive occurrences of *different* cases within the same verse.

Excellent examples of continued insertion of the line at successive occurrences of the *same word* are

* See remarks by Kittel and Klostermann in their Commentaries; also Kamphausen's notes in Kautzsch's German translation.

seen in קָבִיבּ | קָבִיבּ Ezek. 40^{5, 14, 16} (*twice*) 17, 25, 29, 30, 33, 36, 43 41^{5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19} 42^{15, 20} 43¹²; also in נָבֹל | וְעַל | Ezek. 48^{2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27}, but *not* in vv. 8, 21, 28. In Lam. 1¹⁵ and 2^{1, 5, 7}, the line is placed with אֶדְנִי for the purpose of calling attention to the occurrence of this Divine name rather than יְהוָה; but there is *no* line in 3^{31, 36, 58}. Similarly, the continued occurrence of the singular expression מְלָאִים | שְׁנֵיהֶם is noted in Num. 7^{13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 73, 79}.

The same principle of repeated insertion of the line may be applied when two or more peculiarities, of *different* character, occur in the *same* verse: in Ps. 42⁵, no less than three lines are inserted at different points. See also Ps. 10^{13, 14} 18¹ 32⁴ 42⁹ 44²⁴. But such repetition within the same verse is rare.

(b) Other scribes, however, contented themselves with inserting the line at the *first* case only, and left the reader mentally to supply the mark at later instances of the same, or of a different character. This is the general rule.

This practice of inserting the line only at the *first* occurrence of a peculiarity is much more common than repeated insertion. In Lam. 1¹⁵, only the *first* appearance of אֶדְנִי instead of יְהוָה is marked; the second is unmarked. In Gen. 1²⁹, the line is placed before the unexpected form זָרַע only at its first appearance, not at the second. In 1 Sam. 20²¹, the line is inserted to call attention to the first occasion on which the letter מ appears thrice in succession; at the second occurrence in v. 22, there is no line. In Deut. 31³, attention is called, by insertion of the line, to the first occurrence of the expression הוּא עֹבֵר,

but not to the second. In Zeph. 2², the line notes the unnecessary insertion of the negative at its first occurrence, but not at its second. The first occurrence of the short form שְׁלֵמָה in Hag. 1¹² (cf. the full form in v.¹) is noted, but not its later occurrences in 1¹⁴ 2². The first occurrence, in Hag. 2⁴, of the short expression נָאִם יְהוָה (without the addition of עֲבָדוֹת) is noted by the insertion of the line, but not its later occurrences, in vv.^{14. 17. 23}. In Gen. 24¹², Abraham's trusty servant is represented as employing a remarkable designation of the Deity, 'Jehovah, the God of my master Abraham'; this is noted there on its first occurrence, by the inserted line; but though the same expression is repeated in vv.^{27. 42. 48}, the mark is not inserted in any of these later instances. Isa. 36² shows the pointer beside 'Rabshakeh,' on this its first occurrence in the narrative, but afterwards the sign is omitted (vv.^{4. 11. 12. 13. 22}). In Prov. 1⁹ the line calls attention to the rare noun לֵיָּה, at this its first occurrence; but though it appears again only in 4⁹, the mark is not repeated. In Neh. 4¹ (v.⁷ in English), the introductory יְהוָה is marked as superfluous; but though it is followed by the same construction in vv.^{6. 9}, where also it is unnecessary, it is not there marked as such. Similarly, in Isa. 7¹⁸, the cognate וְהָיָה has the line showing that it may be omitted without injuring the context; but it is not inserted in vv.^{21. 22. 23}, though the conditions are similar. In Gen. 23¹⁷, the questionable reading וַיָּקָם is marked, but not its later occurrence in v.²⁰.

See also 1 Sam. 12³, Ps. 115⁷, Isa. 33¹⁴, 1 Chron. 29²; and compare Judg. 18⁷ with vv.^{10. 27}.

But the same principle may likewise be applied when two or more noteworthy peculiarities, *differing in character*, appear in the *same* verse; it may be deemed sufficient to note only the first, on the ground that readers, after their attention has been called to one noteworthy form, should be prepared to find others that might follow. Thus, in Ps. 10⁸, the line is placed only at אֵשׁ, the first word requiring emendation (into אֵשׁ), but others following might with equal reason be marked. In Ps. 22¹⁶, several alterations must be made; but only the first difficulty is marked by the line. Hos. 7¹⁶ is the only place in the chapter which shows the pointer, and this at the beginning of the verse; but other words, besides the first, require emendation. Similarly, Hos. 13² is the only verse in the chapter which has the line, and this after the opening word; yet other emendations are necessary, not only in this verse, but throughout the chapter.

(c) Strangely, also, the line is sometimes actually *not* found at the *first* occurrence of a peculiarity, but is inserted at a *later* instance of the same character. Such cases are, however, comparatively rare. But the following are examples:—

Examination of Judg. 11^{21, 23} shows that the line calls attention only in the *second* of these verses to the unusual expression, 'Jehovah, the God of Israel.' In Lev. 13^{48, 52}, the rare technical terms for 'warp' and 'woof' are marked only at their second occurrence, but not at the first. In Gen. 11^{3, 4}, it is only on the second occurrence of the rare form הִבְהֵ, that the

noting line appears. In Neh. 2¹⁹, attention is called, by the insertion of the line, to the remarkable designation, 'Tobiah, *the servant*, the Ammonite'; yet the same expression is found earlier, in v.¹⁰, though unmarked. In Ezek. 18²⁰, the unexpected insertion of ׀ between the preceding verb and its object עַן* is noted by the inserted pointer; yet the same construction appears, unmarked, in the preceding verse. In 2 Chron. 6^{23, 27}, the line calls attention to the noteworthy expression וְאֵתָהּ ׀ תִּשְׁמַע; but, strangely, it does not appear at the *first* occurrence, in v.²¹; not surprising, however, considering the general usage, is its absence in the later verses, ^{30, 33}. In Jer. 30¹⁵, the line is inserted at the recurrence of an expression ('because of the abundance of thine iniquity,' etc.) which is *not* noted in v.¹⁴.

(4) Most striking, however, is the fact that numerous instances are found, throughout the Scriptures, of single words as well as expressions so remarkable as to demand special consideration, yet these are *without* the note-line we now expect to find. This non-appearance may be accounted for variously.

(a) One sufficient reason for the absence of the pointer may be that these peculiar readings are possibly *irregularities which have originated since the line was introduced in olden times*; and that later transcribers, unaware of its true design and use, though generally retaining it where they found it already inserted, failed to extend its legiti-

* See the normal construction, with the accusative directly subordinated by the verb, in Isa. 53¹². Cf. p. 69.

mate application to more recent instances of suspected readings. Certainly, it would be an incalculable benefit if *all* doubtful readings could be indicated by a simple and convenient sign, like the pointer. A few specimens will now be given of textual difficulties, still unmarked by the line or any other sign, which, presumably, are of comparatively recent origin.

Jer. 3¹ abruptly begins with what is really a connective or intermediary, and not an opening word, viz. לֵאמֹר ('saying'). The Massoretic reading is certainly strange, yet no editorial note marks the word. Cf. p. 54 ff.

In Ps. 93¹, the second לְבָרָא 'he is clothed,' is not marked as a striking repetition, which surely must have originated *after* the early scribes had begun to insert the line. Cf. p. 39.

In Ps. 137, though the line calls attention to singularities in vv.^{1. 3. 6. 7.} (twice)⁹, peculiar readings are to be found in other verses also, all unmarked.

In Prov. 1, the only verses marked by the pointer are vv.^{9. 22. 27}, which certainly contain notable readings. But unmarked textual difficulties occur in other verses also, viz. vv.^{11. 12. 17. 18} etc.*

Prov. 19 exhibits note-lines only in vv.^{7. 10}, where, certainly, difficulties of the text occur; but other perplexing readings appear in vv.^{6. 12. 13. 18. 19} etc.

Prov. 22 shows the line only in vv.^{3. 29}; but

* On these and other instances in the Book of Proverbs, see the recent Commentaries of Toy and Frankenberg, and *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Proverbs*. Some assistance may also be derived from Kautzsch's *Text of Proverbs* (edited by Haupt).

emendations must likewise be made in vv.^{4. 5. 7. 8} etc.

In Prov. 3, the line does not appear till v.²⁸, where an obvious emendation is necessary; but unmarked textual difficulties likewise exist in vv.^{4. 6. 10. 11. 12} etc.

Still more remarkable are Prov. 2, 13, and 14, which do not contain a single note-line, yet present points at which changes must be made; such are v.^{6. 7. 8. 9} etc., 13^{1. 4. 5. 6. 7} etc.; also 14^{7. 9. 12. 14} etc.

Ps. 69 exhibits eight points at which the line appears, viz. in vv.^{1. 3. 5. 7. 14. 16. 21. 36}. In all these cases, indeed, something noteworthy is indicated; several of the verses even contain more than one remarkable form; but other verses in the same Psalm present equally remarkable readings, requiring attention, at which, however, no mark is placed. Thus, in v.²⁷, for אַתָּה 'thou,' we must read the accusative sign אַת; and for יִסְפְּרוּ 'they relate,' we should put יִסְפְּרוּ 'they add.' In v.³³, for רָאוּ 'they have seen,' read יִרְעוּ 'let them shout.'

In Ps. 71, the line is found at seven points, viz. in vv.^{3. 6. 15. 18. 20. 21. 22}; but unmarked difficulties are to be found in vv.^{4. 10. 13. 14} etc.

In Ps. 82, containing 8 verses, the line appears only in v.⁵, near the beginning, though the main difficulty is at the end. But emendations must be made in vv.^{2. 4. 7. 8}, though these contain no sign.

See also 1 Sam. 13¹, 2 Sam. 15⁷, Ezek. 16⁶.

(b) Another obvious reason for irregularity in the insertion of the line is the *varying judgment of the same scribe* at different times, or the *difference of opinion between one*

scribe and another, as to the expediency of marking peculiarities in the text. Subjective standards always vary. Want of uniformity—or even positive inconsistency—in the insertion of the note-line is thus quite natural. A few illustrations will make this clear.

We have already seen* that the repetition of a name, used in addressing the person who bears it, is regularly marked by the line in Gen. 22¹¹ ('Abraham, Abraham'), 46² ('Jacob, Jacob'), 1 Sam. 3¹⁰ ('Samuel, Samuel'); yet the pointer is absent from a precisely parallel case in Ex. 3⁴ ('Moses, Moses').

Attention has already been called † to the remarkable repetition of the line in the case of the expression סָבִיב | סָבִיב in Ezek. 40^{5, 14, 16} etc. It might have been expected that the transcribers—earlier or later—who showed themselves so punctilious in copying the latter portion of the book would have been equally attentive in noting repetitions when these occur in the earlier chapters; yet in 21¹⁴ חֶרֶב חֶרֶב 'a sword, a sword,' remains unmarked, and, still more notably, עֲוֹהָ עֲוֹהָ עֲוֹהָ 'overturn, overturn, overturn,' in v.³².

See also Ezek. 7⁶ 10²¹ 11¹⁵ 16^{6, 23}.

Similarly, in Judg. 13⁷, the line is inserted, in accordance with the general rule, † to mark the striking recurrence of the same letter consecutively in the expression וְאַל-תִּשְׁתֵּי | וְיִין 'drink not wine,' yet the sign is absent from the same expression previously occurring in v.⁴.

In 1 Chron. 2³, after mention of Er, there follows the explanation that he was 'the firstborn of Judah.'

* See p. 39.

† See p. 37.

This has been fitly marked with the line, by a scribe, as really superfluous; yet the same expression remains unmarked by the transcriber of the earlier account in Gen. 18⁷.

The usual form of the name of King Hezekiah is הֶזְקִיָּהוּ (see 2 Kings 18⁹ etc., Isa. 36¹ etc.); the short form הֶזְקִיָּה in Prov. 25¹ is there fitly marked by the note-line prefixed, but not in 2 Kings 18^{1, 10, 14}. (twice) 15. 16, though the ordinary form likewise appears in vv. 9. 13 of the same chapter. Similarly, in 1 Chron. 4⁴¹, the lengthened form יְהֹזָקִיָּהוּ is rightly marked with the line, as rare; yet in Isa. 1¹, where also this third form appears, it is left unmarked.

Compare also Ps. 18 with 2 Sam. 22.

An eminent instance in which the note-line, though specially desirable, is wholly absent, is the Song of Deborah (Judg. 5), abounding in textual difficulties, some of which remain unsolved, in spite of earnest efforts by competent scholars.*

It has now become evident that the insertion of the line to mark noteworthy readings was, at most, occasional. Careful consideration has proved that while the sign appears in many instances of remarkable or even questionable readings, others equally remarkable are without the sign. All this, however, must not be allowed to lessen

* See, among many others, the recent commentaries of Moore and Nowack on the *Book of Judges*, as well as Monographs on the Song by Bruston, Segond, and Rothstein.

regard for the line when it does appear. And even though, from various causes, we may be unable at times to discover a satisfactory reason for the presence of the mark, such instances will prove to be comparatively rare ; while, in the vast majority of passages, it will be found a most important guide in examining the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament.

NOTE.

THE principles observed in preparing the following list of passages which contain the note-line are these:—

1. No distinction has been made between 'Pāsēq' and 'Legarmeh,' as there is no difference. See p. 17.

2. Independent examination has been made of the entire Hebrew Bible: the excellent printed editions of Ginsburg, Letteris, Baer (so far as completed), and others have been used. The lists of 'Pāsēq' and 'Legarmeh' given by Ginsburg (in his magnificent *Massorah*, for which all scholars are profoundly grateful, and in his brief Monograph on the Paseks throughout the Scriptures), by Wickes (in his *Treatise on Prose Accents*, p. 127 ff.), and by Baer, have all been consulted, but likewise largely augmented.

3. In verses containing two adjacent note-lines which might possibly form a pair (see p. 28), it has not always been possible to determine whether they are thus correlated, or are independent.

4. When the line appears in some editions but not in others (see pp. 3 and 105), the fuller recension has been followed.

APPENDIX.

LIST OF PASSAGES IN WHICH THE NOTE-LINE APPEARS.

GENESIS.

CHAP.

1. 5, 10, 21, 27, 29, 30.
2. 5, 21, 22.
3. 14, 15, 22 (twice).
6. 16.
7. 2, 21, 23 (twice).
8. 20.
11. 4.
12. 17.
13. 10, 16.
14. 2, 15.
15. 1, 13.
17. 8, 13, 14, 20.
18. 15 (thrice), 21, 25.
19. 9, 14 (twice), 16.
21. 14, 17.
22. 11, 12, 14.
23. 6 (twice), 17.
24. 7, 12, 30.
26. 18, 28, 32.
27. 1.
28. 9.
29. 9, 13.
30. 8, 16, 20, 32.
31. 29, 33, 51.
32. 23.
35. 5.
36. 12, 43.

CHAP.

37. 2, 20, 22.
38. 24, 29.
39. 8, 10, 23.
40. 13, 19, 20 (twice).
41. 5, 22, 48.
42. 13, 21, 22.
43. 11.
45. 5.
46. 2 (twice), 15.
47. 29.
48. 7.

EXODUS.

2. 11.
3. 8.
4. 18.
6. 5.
7. 17, 19, 20.
8. 5.
9. 14.
10. 5.
11. 2, 3, 7.
12. 15, 19, 29.
13. 12, 17, 18.
14. 10, 20, 21.
15. 18, 26.
16. 5, 22, 29, 32.
17. 6, 7, 15.
18. 12.

EXODUS—*continued*.

CHAP.

19. 11.
 20. 4 (thrice), 10 (twice).
 21. 32.
 22. 10, 24.
 23. 17, 31.
 25. 32.
 26. 2, 8.
 27. 16, 18, 20.
 29. 22 (twice), 27.
 30. 4, 13, 34.
 31. 7.
 32. 1 (twice), 23, 34.
 33. 7, 16.
 34. 6 (twice), 7, 15, 23, 27.
 35. 16, 22, 35.
 36. 1.
 37. 16, 18, 27.
 38. 9, 24.
 39. 39.

LEVITICUS.

4. 7, 18.
 5. 12.
 7. 12, 16, 21, 34.
 8. 2, 23, 26.
 10. 3, 6 (twice), 9 (twice), 12, 14, 16, 17.
 11. 3, 26, 27, 32, 35, 42, 45.
 12. 6.
 13. 3, 21, 26, 45, 49, 52, 55, 59.
 14. 6, 28, 51.
 16. 13, 17, 27.
 19. 34.
 20. 2, 5.
 21. 10.
 22. 3.
 23. 17, 20, 21.
 25. 16, 22.
 27. 16.

NUMBERS.

3. 2, 4, 38.
 4. 7, 9, 11, 16, 19, 26 (twice).
 5. 22.
 6. 20, 25, 26.
 7. 7, 8, 13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79, 84, 88.

CHAP.

8. 19.
 9. 10, 13.
 10. 29, 31, 32, 35.
 11. 15, 19, 20, 25, 26 (twice), 31, 32.
 14. 14, 35.
 15. 30, 31.
 16. 7 (twice), 17.
 17. 12, 17, 21, 28.
 18. 15, 19.
 19. 2, 9.
 20. 5, 21.
 21. 1.
 22. 20.
 26. 2, 58, 59, 62.
 30. 13.
 31. 19, 30 (twice), 52.
 32. 1, 29, 33 (thrice).
 35. 5, 14, 16.

DEUTERONOMY.

1. 7, 28, 33, 41.
 2. 7, 14.
 3. 10, 20, 27.
 4. 5, 32, 34, 47.
 5. 4, 8 (thrice), 12, 14, 15, 16, 22, 24.
 6. 4, 10, 22.
 7. 1, 6, 12, 26 (twice).
 8. 15 (twice).
 9. 4, 5, 7, 21.
 11. 2, 25.
 12. 15.
 13. 6, 7.
 14. 23, 28.
 15. 10.
 16. 11, 16 (twice).
 17. 3, 6, 8.
 18. 14.
 19. 15.
 22. 6 (twice), 22, 24.
 23. 15.
 25. 19.
 26. 2, 5.
 27. 3, 9.
 28. 12, 13, 20, 25, 55, 57, 68.
 30. 9 (twice).
 31. 3, 6, 8, 10, 16 (twice), 20, 24.
 32. 39.

JOSHUA.

CHAP.

1. 11 (twice), 15 (twice).
 3. 4.
 5. 4, 6, 14.
 6. 5, 15, 19, 24.
 7. 7.
 1, 33 (four times).
 9. 10, 12.
 10. 5, 11, 12, 23, 27.
 11. 20.
 12. 1.
 13. 3 (twice), 21, 30.
 14. 6.
 15. 7, 18, 25, 55.
 17. 4.
 18. 19.
 19. 11, 47, 51 (thrice).
 20. 4, 6 (twice), 9.
 21. 13, 32.
 22. 4, 5, 7, 9, 16, 20, 22 (four times), 32.
 23. 10, 12, 14.
 24. 7, 13, 31.

JUDGES.

1. 7.
 2. 7, 12 (twice), 15, 18, 19.
 3. 3, 20.
 4. 6.
 6. 2, 8, 24, 31.
 7. 4.
 8. 12.
 9. 28, 54.
 10. 4, 6 (twice).
 11. 17, 23, 39, 40.
 12. 1 (twice).
 13. 7.
 14. 15, 17, 19.
 15. 19.
 16. 2, 3, 29, 31.
 18. 2, 7, 10, 19.
 19. 1, 8, 16.
 20. 10, 16, 25, 28, 31, 33, 35.
 21. 19, 22.

RUTH.

1. 2, 13.
 2. 21.

CHAP.

3. 3, 13.
 4. 11.

1 SAMUEL.

1. 11.
 2. 15, 16, 19.
 3. 9, 10.
 4. 18 (twice).
 5. 4, 9.
 6. 8, 15, 18.
 7. 1, 6, 10, 14.
 9. 9, 10, 12, 16, 24.
 10. 3, 18.
 11. 7.
 12. 2, 3, 21, 24.
 13. 5, 8.
 14. 3, 6, 12, 36, 47 (twice).
 16. 5, 7.
 17. 23, 25 (thrice), 28, 40.
 18. 10 (thrice), 27.
 19. 9.
 20. 1, 9, 12, 21, 25, 41, 42.
 21. 10.
 22. 3, 17, 18.
 24. 10 (double), 16.
 25. 13 (twice), 14, 20, 25, 29, 31, 34.
 26. 6, 7, 16, 19, 23.
 27. 1.
 28. 12, 15.
 29. 3.
 30. 21 (double), 22, 24.
 31. 4, 7.

2 SAMUEL.

1. 2, 6, 10.
 2. 1, 7, 16.
 3. 8, 12, 13, 18, 21.
 4. 9.
 6. 2, 5, 16.
 7. 12, 24, 28.
 10. 14.
 11. 1, 2.
 12. 9, 11, 18, 23.
 13. 29, 32, 36.
 14. 7, 17, 19, 26, 32.
 15. 20, 21, 30.
 16. 8.
 17. 18, 21.
 19. 1, 7 (twice), 10, 36, 38.
 20. 3, 8, 10.

2 SAMUEL—*continued*.

CHAP.

21. 16, 20.
23. 8, 10, 18.
24. 2, 3, 13 (twice), 16, 17 (twice).

1 KINGS.

1. 13, 25, 32, 36.
2. 3, 30, 31, 37.
3. 12, 14, 15 (twice), 26.
4. 19.
5. 4, 19, 20.
6. 27, 29.
7. 2, 23, 24, 25 (twice), 29 (twice),
38, 51.
8. 20, 25, 32, 36, 47, 53, 54, 59,
65 (twice).
9. 15, 19, 23.
10. 10, 22.
11. 14, 22, 32, 33, 34, 36.
12. 2, 16, 27, 32 (thrice), 33.
13. 1, 4, 6, 9, 11.
14. 21.
15. 5, 13, 18.
16. 2, 7 (twice).
17. 10.
18. 5, 10, 12 (twice), 23, 36, 40, 45.
19. 4, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14.
20. 6, 13, 25 (twice), 29, 30, 39.
21. 2 (twice), 15.
22. 8, 13, 38.

2 KINGS.

1. 6, 13, 17.
2. 4, 5, 12, 14, 23.
3. 16, 17.
4. 6, 13, 19.
5. 8, 11, 20, 22.
6. 32 (twice).
7. 1 (twice), 6, 9.
8. 14, 18.
9. 7.
10. 5, 6 (twice), 25.
11. 4, 11, 15, 19.
12. 22.
13. 3, 14, 16, 21.
17. 29, 36, 41 (twice).
18. 4, 12, 14 (thrice), 17.
19. 4 (twice), 6, 11, 16, 23, 35, 37.

CHAP.

20. 5, 13, 14, 17.
21. 8.
22. 12, 14, 17, 19.
23. 3, 12, 13 (twice), 19, 26.
24. 2 (twice), 3, 14, 20.
25. 4 (twice), 16, 17 (twice), 19, 25.

1 CHRONICLES.

2. 3, 25.
3. 1.
4. 41, 42.
5. 14, 26.
8. 38.
9. 20, 44.
10. 4.
11. 23.
12. 18, 20, 37, 40.
13. 6.
15. 2, 18, 27, 29.
16. 39.
17. 22, 25.
18. 8.
19. 2.
20. 1 (two), 2, 6.
21. 12 (two), 15 (two), 18.
22. 3, 5, 18.
24. 31.
26. 8, 26.
27. 1 (four), 4.
28. 10.
29. 2, 6, 11, 21, 23.

2 CHRONICLES.

1. 12.
2. 3, 9.
3. 5.
4. 2, 3, 4 (two).
5. 1.
6. 10, 16, 23, 27, 32, 37.
7. 3, 9, 22.
8. 1, 6.
9. 8, 9, 21.
10. 16 (two).
12. 6, 7, 13.
13. 5, 8, 12.
14. 6.
15. 3, 16.

2 CHRONICLES—*continued*.

CHAP.

16. 8.
 17. 10.
 18. 3, 7, 12.
 19. 10 (two), 11.
 20. 1, 7, 8, 22.
 21. 3, 6, 12, 18, 19 (two).
 23. 10, 14, 20.
 24. 5, 20, 23, 24.
 25. 16.
 26. 15, 17, 21.
 28. 7, 9.
 30. 10, 19, 21, 25.
 31. 2, 21.
 32. 22, 31.
 33. 8, 14.
 34. 3, 9, 12, 20, 22, 25, 27.
 35. 18, 21 (two), 25.
 36. 23.

EZRA.

2. 1.
 3. 8.
 4. 2.
 5. 6, 8, 15.
 6. 1, 9 (three), 12.
 7. 11, 17.
 8. 35, 36.
 9. 7, 8, 13.
 10. 9, 14.

NEHEMIAH.

1. 4.
 2. 1, 2, 6, 12 (two), 13, 19.
 3. 14, 34.
 4. 1, 10.
 5. 14.
 6. 17.
 7. 6.
 8. 3, 6, 7 (two), 17, 18.
 11. 33.
 13. 15 (two), 23.

ESTHER.

1. 2, 3, 5, 6 (two), 8, 14, 15, 18.
 2. 12, 14, 15.
 3. 1, 7, 12.
 4. 7.

CHAP.

5. 1, 14.
 7. 8.
 8. 9, 11, 15.
 9. 7 (three), 8 (three), 9 (four),
 16, 27 (two).
 10. 1, 3.

JOB.

1. 1, 16, 17 (two), 19.
 2. 11.
 3. 13, 26.
 4. 5, 16, 19.
 5. 5, 6, 19.
 6. 10.
 7. 20, 21.
 9. 24.
 10. 3, 17, 22.
 11. 6 (two), 15.
 12. 3, 4, 6.
 13. 14, 27.
 14. 5, 13, 19.
 15. 23, 24, 28, 30.
 16. 4, 9 (two), 10, 12.
 18. 2.
 19. 3, 12, 27, 29.
 20. 20, 23, 29 (two).
 21. 8, 17, 28.
 24. 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 24.
 26. 14.
 27. 9, 13 (two).
 28. 3, 4, 28.
 30. 1.
 31. 2, 34, 35, 40.
 32. 2, 6 (two), 11.
 33. 15, 23, 26, 27.
 34. 10, 19, 20, 29, 33.
 35. 13.
 36. 16, 28.
 37. 4, 6, 12 (two), 14, 21.
 38. 1, 2.
 39. 25.
 40. 6, 9, 23.
 42. 3, 8 (two).

PSALMS.

1. 1, 2, 3, 5.
 2. 2, 12.
 3. 1, 8.

PSALMS—*continued.*

CHAP.

4. 2.
 5. 2, 3, 5 (two), 7, 9, 11.
 6. 7, 11 (in some editions),
 7. 6 (two), 7, 10.
 8. 3.
 9. 7, 14, 17, 21.
 10. 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13 (two), 14
 (three).
 11. 1, 4.
 12. 3, 5, 8.
 13. 2, 3, 6.
 14. 5.
 15. 3, 4, 5.
 16. 9, 10.
 17. 1, 3, 14.
 18. 1 (two), 7 (two), 8, 9, 12, 14,
 16, 31, 50 (two), 51.
 19. 5 (two), 7, 10, 14, 15.
 20. 2, 6, 7, 8.
 21. 5, 10.
 22. 16, 24, 27, 28, 30.
 23. 5.
 24. 7, 9.
 25. 5, 7.
 26. 1.
 27. 1 (two), 2, 3, 4, 5, 9.
 28. 1, 5, 7, 9.
 29. 9, 11.
 30. 6, 11, 13.
 31. 3 (two), 12, 14, 15, 21, 23.
 32. 4 (two), 6, 8, 9.
 33. 12.
 35. 1, 10, 13, 21, 26.
 36. 5, 7.
 37. 1, 7, 14, 20, 28, 34.
 38. 12, 13.
 39. 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13 (two).
 40. 3, 4, 6 (two), 10, 11, 15, 16,
 17 (two), 18.
 41. 3, 7, 8, 10, 14 (two).
 42. 3, 5 (three), 6, 9 (two), 10, 11,
 12.
 43. 1, 2, 4, 5.
 44. 2, 3, 9, 24 (two).
 45. 2 (two), 5, 13.
 47. 9, 10.
 48. 9, 11, 12, 14, 15.
 49. 11, 12, 14, 15.

CHAP.

50. 1, 6, 7, 16, 21.
 51. 6, 16, 18.
 52. 2, 5.
 54. 5.
 55. 16, 20 (two), 22, 23, 24 (two).
 56. 1, 7, 8, 10.
 57. 2, 4, 5, 7, 10.
 58. 7.
 59. 2, 8, 12, 17.
 60. 2, 8, 9, 10.
 61. 3, 9.
 62. 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.
 63. 2 (two).
 64. 6.
 65. 5, 6, 8, 10, 14.
 66. 4, 6, 7 (two), 8.
 67. 4, 5, 6.
 68. 5, 7 (two), 9, 17, 19 (two), 20,
 21, 24, 28, 31, 36 (two).
 69. 1, 3, 5, 7, 14, 16, 21, 36.
 70. 4, 5, 6.
 71. 3, 6, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22.
 72. 1, 4, 16, 17, 18, 19 (two).
 73. 8, 10, 20, 28 (two).
 74. 2 (two), 18.
 75. 2, 9.
 76. 6, 8.
 77. 3, 4, 8, 17, 18, 19.
 78. 4, 5, 6, 8, 20, 21, 31, 38, 55, 65.
 79. 1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 13.
 80. 2, 3.
 81. 6, 11.
 82. 5.
 84. 3, 4 (three), 7, 12.
 85. 9.
 86. 8, 9 (two), 11, 12, 14.
 87. 4, 5.
 88. 6, 14.
 89. 2, 3, 9 (two), 50 (two), 52, 53.
 90. 2, 10, 17.
 91. 4, 7, 15.
 92. 8, 10.
 93. 3, 4, 5.
 94. 3, 14, 17, 23.
 95. 10.
 96. 5, 10, 13.
 97. 7, 8, 9.
 98. 1, 3, 6.
 99. 4, 6.

PSALMS--*continued.*

CHAP.

100. 3, 4.
 101. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7.
 102. 3, 20, 27.
 103. 1, 17, 22.
 104. 8, 14, 15, 24, 25, 35 (two).
 105. 3, 45.
 106. 1, 5, 7, 47, 48 (two).
 108. 4, 8, 9, 10.
 109. 14, 16, 20, 21, 25, 28.
 110. 1, 4.
 111. 1, 9, 10.
 112. 1, 9, 10.
 113. 1, 4, 9.
 115. 1, 7, 18.
 116. 1, 3, 19.
 117. 2.
 118. 15, 27.
 119. 52, 69, 104, 128, 156.
 122. 5.
 125. 3.
 126. 6.
 127. 1 (two), 2.
 128. 3.
 129. 8.
 131. 1 (two), 2.
 132. 11, 12, 17.
 133. 2, 3.
 134. 1.
 135. 1, 9, 11, 21.
 137. 1, 3, 6, 7 (two), 9.
 138. 1, 2.
 139. 16, 19, 21.
 140. 5, 6.
 141. 4 (three), 5, 8.
 142. 4, 5, 7, 8.
 143. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.
 144. 1 (two), 12.
 146. 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.
 147. 1, 8, 20.
 148. 1, 4, 13, 14.
 149. 1, 9.
 150. 1.

PROVERBS.

1. 9, 22, 27.
 3. 28.
 5. 21.
 6. 3 (two), 9, 10, 14, 22, 27.

CHAP.

7. 12.
 8. 13, 21, 29, 31, 34.
 9. 7.
 10. 26.
 15. 25.
 16. 10, 11.
 19. 7, 10.
 21. 20, 29.
 22. 3, 29.
 23. 5, 7, 29 (two).
 24. 12, 14, 16, 20, 27, 31, 34.
 25. 1, 13, 20, 28.
 26. 1.
 27. 10, 12, 14, 22, 27.
 28. 10, 24.
 29. 13.
 30. 1, 4 (three), 8, 9, 15 (two), 17,
 19, 20.
 31. 4, 15.

ECCLESIASTES.

1. 6, 13.
 2. 3, 12.
 4. 1, 8.
 5. 17.
 6. 2.
 7. 24.
 8. 14.
 9. 3.

CANTICLES.

1. 13, 14.
 2. 7.
 3. 5.
 4. 8, 12 (two), 14.
 5. 2.
 8. 4, 14.

ISAIAH.

1. 4.
 2. 2, 3.
 3. 7.
 4. 3, 4, 5.
 5. 19.
 6. 2 (two), 3.
 7. 18.
 8. 4.
 9. 3, 16.
 10. 13, 14, 20, 27.

ISMAIAH—*continued*.

CHAP.

11. 11 (two).
 13. 8.
 15. 5.
 17. 9.
 18. 2, 7.
 19. 16.
 21. 2 (two), 8, 15.
 22. 2, 13 (two), 24.
 23. 1, 13, 17.
 24. 3 (two).
 25. 7.
 26. 3.
 27. 9, 13.
 28. 12.
 30. 25.
 31. 4.
 33. 14.
 36. 2.
 37. 2, 4 (two), 6, 11, 17, 24, 36, 38.
 39. 2, 3, 6.
 40. 28.
 41. 22.
 42. 5.
 45. 1, 14.
 47. 1.
 48. 1.
 49. 5, 8, 21, 25.
 50. 1, 4, 10, 11.
 52. 1.
 54. 2.
 56. 4.
 57. 19.
 58. 2.
 60. 9.
 61. 3, 11.
 63. 1, 3, 7, 9, 11.
 65. 8, 13 (two).
 66. 12, 19, 20 (three).

JEREMIAH.

1. 10, 13, 15.
 2. 5, 13, 24.
 4. 1, 3, 10, 13, 19 (double), 22.
 5. 15.
 6. 1, 11, 14, 16.
 7. 9, 14, 16, 20, 34.
 8. 1, 2, 11.

CHAP.

9. 2, 22.
 10. 2.
 11. 5, 14, 16, 19.
 12. 5, 14.
 13. 10.
 14. 13, 16.
 15. 11, 12.
 16. 3, 5.
 17. 5, 8, 16, 24, 25 (two), 27.
 18. 20.
 19. 4, 11.
 20. 4.
 21. 7 (three).
 22. 3, 6, 30.
 23. 6, 19.
 24. 8 (two).
 25. 3, 25, 26.
 26. 2, 8, 10, 15, 18.
 27. 12, 18.
 28. 1, 3, 11, 14.
 29. 16, 18, 21, 32 (double).
 30. 8, 11, 15, 18, 23.
 31. 6, 14, 15, 34, 36, 39.
 32. 8, 17, 35, 36, 43, 44.
 33. 2, 10, 12, 16.
 34. 1.
 35. 5, 15 (double).
 36. 23, 27, 32.
 37. 7.
 38. 4 (two), 6, 11, 20.
 39. 4.
 40. 1, 7, 8, 11 (two), 14.
 41. 1, 2, 9, 10.
 42. 6, 16.
 44. 9, 14, 17, 25, 26 (double), 30.
 45. 4.
 46. 16, 28.
 47. 2.
 48. 20, 27.
 49. 12, 28, 37 (two), 39.
 50. 14, 29, 34.
 51. 2, 6, 24, 37 (double), 59.
 52. 3, 15, 20, 25.

LAMENTATIONS.

1. 1, 15, 16 (two).
 2. 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 19.
 5. 21.

EZEKIEL.

CHAP.

1. 1, 4, 27.
 3. 6, 13, 27 (two).
 4. 9.
 5. 1, 7.
 6. 13.
 7. 11.
 8. 1, 3, 6, 10.
 9. 2 (two), 3, 11.
 10. 2.
 11. 13.
 12. 25.
 13. 11, 18 (two), 20.
 14. 4, 6, 21.
 16. 14, 43, 52.
 17. 3, 9, 24.
 18. 20.
 20. 1, 30, 32, 39, 40.
 21. 3, 20, 24, 27.
 22. 11.
 24. 6, 17, 21.
 26. 15, 16.
 28. 2, 25.
 29. 3, 12.
 32. 24.
 33. 11 (two), 25 (two).
 34. 2, 8 (two).
 35. 12 (two).
 36. 3, 5, 6, 36.
 37. 2, 9.
 38. 8 (two), 10, 13, 14, 18, 19.
 39. 9, 11, 17 (two).
 40. 1, 5, 6, 14, 16 (two), 17, 25,
 29, 30, 33, 36, 43, 47.
 41. 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16 (two),
 17, 19.
 42. 10, 13 (two), 15, 20.
 43. 12.
 45. 1.
 47. 9, 12 (two), 16, 17.
 48. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 18, 21 (three),
 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 35.

DANIEL.

2. 23, 24, 35.
 3. 2, 5, 15.
 4. 6, 9, 15 (two), 20, 22 (two),
 29, 31, 33.

CHAP.

5. 2, 7, 12, 21, 23, 29.
 6. 8, 11, 27 (two).
 7. 9, 28.
 8. 3, 5, 7.
 9. 12, 13, 15, 17, 18 (two), 19
 (two), 24, 27.
 10. 12, 13.
 11. 6, 14, 17, 18.
 12. 7.

HOSEA.

1. 1.
 2. 23.
 3. 4.
 4. 3.
 5. 1.
 7. 16.
 9. 1, 4, 7.
 13. 2.
 14. 4.

JOEL.

[No insertions.]

AMOS.

1. 1, 2.
 8. 9, 11.
 9. 8.

OBADIAH.

[No insertions.]

JONAH.

1. 3.
 4. 6, 8.

MICAH.

1. 1.
 3. 11.
 4. 1, 2, 9.
 5. 4, 6.

NAHUM.

1. 12.
 3. 19.

HABAKKUK.

3. 5, 16.

ZEPHANIAH.

CHAP.

1. 1.
2. 2, 15.
3. 11, 15.

HAGGAI.

1. 12 (two).
2. 4, 12, 20.

ZECHARIAH.

1. 6, 8, 17.
3. 8, 9.
4. 7.

CHAP.

6. 15.
8. 17.
9. 11.
10. 6.
11. 12.
12. 10.
13. 2, 4, 9.
14. 2, 8, 12 (two).

MALACHI.

1. 6.
2. 5, 11, 14, 17.
3. 1, 5.

INDEX.



- ABNORMAL forms noted by the line, 58.
 Abrupt transitions noted, 53.
 Absence of the line remarkable, 105 ff.
 Absolute use of nouns, 67; absolute use of verbs, in the infinitive, 70.
 Accentual system in the Hebrew Scriptures, 11, 15, 17. 'Paseq' not an accent, 11, 16.
 Adjacent similars noted by the line, 37 ff.
 Alliteration noted, 43.
 Anacoloutha indicated, 57.
 Anthropopathic expressions, 77.
 Antiquity of the note-line, 10, 19.
 Arrangement of verses noted as questionable, 72.
 Article : its abnormal omission or insertion, 64 ff.
 Attributives abnormally placed, 68.

 Change of construction noted, 71.
 Circumlocution for the genitive, 67.
 Classification of instances in which the note-line appears, 34 ff.
 Coincidence of note-line and Qerî, 13; of note-line and Sebirîn, 14.
 Confirmation of textual peculiarities by the Septuagint, 20.
 Conflate readings noted, 43, 51.
 Conjunctions peculiarly used, 70.
 Conservatism of Hebrew Scribes, 6, 79.
 Consonants the original constituents of the Hebrew text, 14, 19.
 Construct state noted when peculiar, 66.
 Constructions noted when peculiar, 64.
 Criticism of the text furthered by the line, 78 ff., 98 ff.

 Dagesh, 15.
 Darga, 17.
 Difficult readings solved, 78 ff.; difficult readings left unsolved, 90.
 Difficulties indicated, 78, 98; difficulties often left unmarked, 20.
 Discordant subject and predicate noted, 68.
 Displacement of words from their natural order, 73.
 Divine names marked as peculiar, 34.
 Double note-line, 28.
 Doubtful insertions of the line, 102.

 Early origin of the note-line, 10, 19.
 Editions of printed Hebrew Bibles vary in their insertion of the line, 3, 105.

- Emendation of suspected readings, 79.
- Foreign names noted, 58.
- Frequency with which the line is used, 2, 3.
- Grammatical constructions noted, if abnormal, 64.
- Inadvertent repetitions, 48.
- Infinitive with finite verb, 42; infinitive instead of finite verb, 70.
- Insertion of note-line: its position, 1 ff.; repeated insertion, 3 f., 107; rules for insertion, 22; insertion of word between a construct and its genitive, 67.
- Intentional insertions, 49.
- Interpolations, 49.
- Irregular forms noted, 60.
- Irregular insertions, 30 ff., 104 ff.
- Kethib and Qerî, 12.
- Legarmeh and 'Paseq,' 2 (foot-note), 17.
- Manuscripts vary in inserting the line, 3, 105.
- Mappiq, 15.
- Massoretes and their signs, 10 ff.
- Merka, 17.
- Metheg, 17.
- Misplacement of note-lines, 32 f.
- Munach, 17.
- Needless letters or words noted, 44 ff.
- Non-appearance of the line remarkable, 110.
- Note-line misnamed 'Paseq' or 'Pesiq,' 1, 6; early origin, 10 f., 19 f.; irregular insertions, 2, 3; indicator of difficulties, 20, 78, 90 f., 98 f.; number of insertions in one verse, 2 f., 7 f.; not an 'accent,' 11.
- Nouns in unusual construction, 66.
- Object of the note-line, 4.
- Omission of the line, 3, 105 ff., 113; omission of letters or words noted, 54 ff.; omission of relative, 68.
- Order of words noted, 72.
- Origen's Hexapla, 33.
- Origin of the note-line, 4, 10, 21.
- Ortenberg on the irregular insertion of the line, 32.
- Pair of note-lines, 28.
- Parallel texts vary in use of the line, 106.
- Participle with pronoun instead of finite verb, 70.
- Paseq: signification of the word, 1; misleading name, 10 ff.
- Peculiar constructions noted, 64; peculiar forms noted, 58; peculiarities not always marked, 106 ff.
- Place for inserting note-line in a verse, 22 ff.
- Pleonasms noted by the line, 50.
- Poetic terms noted, 58.
- Post-insertion of the note-line, 30.
- Premonitory insertion of the line, 25.
- Proofs that the line is very ancient, 19.
- Proper names noted, if peculiar, 59.
- Purity of text, 7, 110.
- Qerî and Kethib, 12 ff.
- Questionable arrangement of words in a sentence, 72; questionable statements noted, 75; questionable readings, 78.
- Raphé, 15.
- Rare words noted, 58.
- Readings questioned, 78.
- Rearrangement of verses noted, 72.

- Relation of note-line to other marks, 12 ff.
- Relative sign omitted, 68.
- Remarkable order of words in a sentence, 72.
- Repeated insertion of the note-line, 9; repeated letters or words generally marked by the line, 37 ff., 48 ff.; repeated peculiarities not always noted, 106.
- Rules for insertion of the note-line, 22.
- Sebirin, 13 ff.
- Separation rarely indicated by the note-line, 2, 38.
- Septuagint confirms readings noted by the line, 20.
- Sillûq, 3.
- Similar words, when adjacent, noted by the line, 41.
- Single insertion of the line, 7 ff.
- Strange statements noted, 75.
- Substitution of readings, 78 ff.
- Sudden change of person or subject, 53.
- Superfluities noted, 44.
- Suspected readings, 78 ff.
- Synonymous expressions noted, 50.
- Syro-Hexaplar, 33.
- Text questioned, 78.
- Textual criticism furthered by the note-line, 78 f., 98 f.
- Transition from one subject to another, 53.
- Unexplained insertions of the line, 102.
- Uniform insertion of the line not observed, 104.
- Uninflected verbs noted, 70.
- Unique forms noted, 62.
- Unnecessary letters or words noted, 44 ff.
- Unusual forms noted, 58.
- Variety in use of the line, 104 ff.
- Verb - constructions noted, when peculiar, 68; verbs noted, when uninflected, 70.
- Verse - arrangement marked as improbable, 72.
- Vowel-marks in the Massoretic text, 11, 14.
- Wickes (Dr. W.) on the accents and 'Paseq,' 11, 18.
- Word-arrangement noted, 72.

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED
Edinburgh.

TWO NEW VOLUMES now ready,

Dr. C. H. TOY on PROVERBS.

Dr. H. P. SMITH on I. & II. SAMUEL.

[See page 3.]

The
International Critical Commentary
on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and
New Testaments.

UNDER THE EDITORSHIP OF

THE REV. SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER, D.D.,
Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford;

THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D.,
Master of University College, Durham;

AND

THE REV. CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D.,
*Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology,
Union Theological Seminary, New York.*

The time has come, in the judgment of the projectors of this enterprise, when it is practicable to combine British and American scholars in the production of a critical, comprehensive Commentary that will be abreast of modern biblical scholarship, and in a measure lead its van. The Commentaries will be international and inter-confessional, and will be free from polemical and ecclesiastical bias. They will be based upon a thorough critical study of the original texts of the Bible, and upon critical methods of interpretation.

NINE VOLUMES OF THE SERIES ARE NOW READY.—See following pages.

'The publication of this series marks an epoch in English exegesis.'—*British Weekly*.

'We can sincerely congratulate the authors and the publishers upon producing one of the most epoch-making theological series of the day.'—*Church Bells*.

"The International Critical Commentary" promises to be one of the most successful enterprises of an enterprising age. . . . So far as it has gone it satisfies the highest expectations and requirements.'—*Bookman*.

'This series seems likely to surpass all previous enterprises of the kind in Great Britain and America.'—*Methodist Times*.

"The International Critical Commentary" has vindicated its claim to stand in the front rank of modern English exegesis. Every volume that has hitherto appeared has ranked with the foremost on the book expounded.'—*Methodist Recorder*.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

LONDON AGENTS:

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, & CO. LTD.

To be had from all Booksellers.

[P.T.O.]

*

In post 8vo, Second Edition (pp. 530), price 12s.,

DEUTERONOMY

BY THE

REV. S. R. DRIVER, D.D.,

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH,
OXFORD.

Professor G. A. SMITH (in the *Critical Review*) says: 'The series could have had no better introduction than this volume from its Old Testament editor. . . . Dr. Driver has achieved a commentary of rare learning and still more rare candour and sobriety of judgment. . . . It is everywhere based on an independent study of the text and history . . . it has a large number of new details: its treatment of the religious value of the book is beyond praise. We find, in short, all those virtues which are conspicuous in the author's previous works, with a warmer and more interesting style of expression.'

'There is plenty of room for such a comprehensive commentary as that which we are now promised, and if the subsequent volumes of the series come up to the standard of excellence set in the work that now lies before us, the series will supply a real want in our literature. . . . The Introduction is a masterly piece of work, and here the Oxford Professor of Hebrew is at his best. It gives by far the best and fairest discussion that we have ever seen of the critical problems connected with the book.'—*Guardian*.

'We have said enough, we hope, to send the student to this commentary. . . . To the diligent miner there is a wealth of gold and precious stones awaiting his toil and industry.'—*Church Bells*.

'The commentary on the text of Deuteronomy is characterised by the highest learning and fulness of research, and will be of great value, not only to the ordinary student, but to the mature scholar.'—*Record*.

'The work will be not less a treasure to the English student than a credit to English scholarship.'—*Christian World*.

In post 8vo (pp. 526), price 12s.,

JUDGES

BY THE

REV. GEORGE F. MOORE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW IN ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MASS.

Professor H. E. RYLE, D.D., says: 'I think it may safely be averred that so full and scientific a commentary upon the text and subject-matter of the Book of Judges has never been produced in the English language.'

'Dr. Moore's "Judges" will come as a deep surprise to many in this country. It is not in any respect, so far as we have been able to judge, of lighter weight than the two great volumes of the series which appeared before it.'—*Expository Times*.

'It is unquestionably the best commentary that has hitherto been published on the Book of Judges.'—*London Quarterly Review*.

'Professor Moore of Andover follows up Canon Driver's volume on Deuteronomy with a commentary on Judges, marked by as great learning—it could not be greater—and perhaps by somewhat more freedom of expression. . . . He has examined every word, every letter, of the original text under the microscope.'—*Academy*.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

Just published, in post 8vo (pp. 460), price 12s.,

THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL

BY

HENRY P. SMITH, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND INTERPRETATION IN AMHERST COLLEGE.

'The commentary is the most complete and minute hitherto published by an English-speaking scholar.'—*Literature*.

'This latest volume of "The International Critical Commentary" is in nowise behind its predecessors in thoroughness and scholarship. We have only to compare it with any earlier English commentary on the same books to see how much our knowledge in every department of biblical scholarship has advanced during the past few years . . . The new light gained from Semitic folk-lore and the comparative study of Eastern customs and traditions is very welcome, and has been employed to illustrate the history, as also that coming from our modern geographical and archaeological research.'—*Church Bells*.

Just published, in post 8vo (pp. 590), price 12s.,

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS

BY

C. H. TOY, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

'The commentary is full, though scholarly and business-like, and must at once take its place as the authority on "Proverbs."'—*Bookman*.

'It is difficult to speak too highly of this volume. . . . The result is a first-rate book. It is rich in learning.'—*Jewish Chronicle*.

In post 8vo (pp. 375), price 10s. 6d.,

ST. MARK'S GOSPEL

BY THE

REV. EZRA P. GOULD, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE,
DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA.

'This commentary is written with ability and judgment; it contains much valuable material, and it carries the reader satisfactorily through the Gospel. Great care has been spent upon the text.'—*Expositor*.

'Everything relating to the department of criticism on these points is more thoroughly explained and illustrated here than has ever been done before in an English commentary.'—*Methodist Times*.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

In post 8vo, Third Edition (pp. 678), price 12s.,

ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL

BY THE

REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D.,

MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM,
FORMERLY FELLOW AND SENIOR TUTOR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

'It is distinguished throughout by learning, sobriety of judgment, and sound exegesis. It is a weighty contribution to the interpretation of the Third Gospel, and will take an honourable place in the series of which it forms a part.'—*Critical Review*.

'The best commentary on St. Luke yet published. Dr. Plummer's gifts for the work were already well known and appreciated, and he has not disappointed us in this his latest work.'—*Church Bells*.

'Marked by great learning and extreme common sense. . . . Altogether the book is far and away the best commentary on Luke we yet have in English.'—*Biblical World*.

'We feel heartily that the book will bring credit to English scholarship, and that in its carefulness, its sobriety of tone, its thoughtfulness, its reverence, it will contribute to a stronger faith in the essential trustworthiness of the gospel record.'—*Guardian*.

In post 8vo, Fourth Edition (pp. 562), price 12s.,

ROMANS

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D.,

LADY MARGARET PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, AND
CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD;

AND THE

REV. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, B.D.,

FELLOW OF ALL SOULS' COLLEGE, OXFORD.

Principal F. H. CHASE, D.D., Cambridge, says: 'We welcome it as an epoch-making contribution to the study of St. Paul.'

'This is an excellent commentary, scholarly, clear, doctrinal, reverent, and learned. . . . It is a volume which will bring credit to English scholarship, and while it is the crown of much good work on the part of the elder editor, it gives promise of equally good work in the future from both.'—*Guardian*.

'A most valuable gift to the student of Romans. . . . It is the fullest and freshest in learning, the most patient, the most willing to be intelligible, and to make the Apostle so; and it need not be added, in any work of Dr. Sanday, that in textual criticism it will be a standard authority.'—*British Weekly*.

'Will at once take its place in the front rank of similar works. Its rich fulness of learning, its careful and dispassionate statement of difficulties, and its candour, which will not affect an undue positiveness, call upon us to give it a very hearty welcome.'—*Record*.

'It stands easily at the head of English commentaries. It has qualities, especially in what concerns the text, in which it is superior to the best works of Continental scholars.'—*Critical Review*.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

In post 8vo (pp. 368), price 10s. 6d.,

EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS

BY THE

REV. T. K. ABBOTT, D.LIT.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, FORMERLY OF BIBLICAL GREEK, TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

‘For long to come this summary of the results of modern criticism applied to these two Pauline letters is, for the use of scholarly students, not likely to be superseded.’—*Academy*.

‘There is no work in all the “International” series that is more faithful or more felicitous.’—*Expository Times*.

‘All is done in a clear and easy style, and with a point and precision which will make his commentary one that the student will consult with satisfaction. . . . A strong book, with a certain marked individuality.’—*Critical Review*.

In post 8vo (pp. 240), price 8s. 6d.,

PHILIPPIANS AND PHILEMON

BY THE

REV. MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF SACRED LITERATURE IN UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
NEW YORK.

‘It is in all respects such a commentary as is needed for the profitable study and right understanding of these two Epistles. . . . Dr. Vincent has produced a book which may be considered as summing up all that has been previously done for the elucidation of this Epistle of Paul and the shorter one which seems to have been written about the same time. . . . It is, in short, in every way worthy of the series which was so well commenced [in the New Testament] with Dr. Sanday’s and Mr. Headlam’s admirable commentary on the Romans.’—*Scotsman*.

‘He has given us an edition of “Philippians” that takes its place beside its fellows in the very front rank of modern theological literature.’—*Expository Times*.

‘Business-like, full, and competent.’—*British Weekly*.

N.B.—For List of other Volumes in preparation, see page 8 of this Prospectus.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

XXIX.—XXX. *Moses' Third Discourse. Israel formally called upon to enter into the Deuteronomic Covenant.*

The Deuteronomic Code ends with c. 28. C. 29–30 is of the nature of a supplement, insisting afresh upon the fundamental principle of the Code, viz. devotion to Jehovah, and calling upon Israel to yield loyal allegiance to it. The discourse falls naturally into three parts. In the first, Moses, after referring to what Jehovah has done for Israel (29¹⁻⁸ (2-9)), reminds them that the purpose for which they are now assembled together is that they may enter solemnly into covenant with Him, and warns them afresh of the disastrous consequences, including national ruin and exile, which a lapse into idolatry will inevitably entail (29⁹⁻²⁸ (10-29)); in the second, imagining the threatened exile to have taken place, he promises that even then, if Israel sincerely repents, Jehovah will again receive it into His favour, and restore it to the land of promise (30¹⁻¹⁰); in the third, he sums up, in brief but forcible words, the two alternatives placed before Israel, life and happiness on the one side, death and misfortune on the other, and adjures the nation to choose wisely between them (30¹¹⁻²⁰).

In these chapters, the connection is sometimes imperfect, esp. between 30¹⁻¹⁰ and 30¹¹⁻²⁰ (see on 30¹¹); several words and phrases occur, not otherwise found in Dt. (Dillm. notes השביל 29⁸ (9), אלה *oath, imprecation*, 29^{11, 13, 18, 19, 20} (12, 14, 19, 20, 21) 30⁷, *idol-blocks and detestations* 29¹⁶ (17), שרירות 29¹⁷ (18), *stubbornness* 29¹⁸ (19), עֵשֶׂן אֵף 29¹⁹ (20), סלה 29¹⁹ (20), לרעה *unto evil* 29²⁰ (21), חלואים *sicknesses* 29²¹ (22), *forsake the covenant* 29²⁴ (25), נחש *pluck up* 29²⁷ (28), הריח *drive away* 30¹⁻⁴; and the phrases 29⁵ (6) ב. 17 (18) ב. 18 (19) ב.); and the points of contact with Jeremiah are more numerous than usual. A question thus arises, whether the text is throughout in its original order, and whether it is entirely by the same hand as the body of Dt.: see the Introduction, § 4.

XXIX. 1–8 (2–9). Moses reminds the Israelites of all that Jehovah has wrought for them, from the time of their deliverance from Egypt, founding upon it a renewed exhortation to obey the words of the covenant.—The paragraph is a recapitulation of the substance of earlier parts of Dt., stated largely in the same phraseology.—1 (2). *And Moses called unto all Israel* (1¹), *and said unto them*] exactly as 5¹.—*Ye* (emph.) *have*

This laying hold of her hand and the raised voice (ἐφώνησεν) are consonant with waking one out of sleep, and the two may be regarded as the means of the miracle. Comp. and contrast throughout Acts ix. 36-42.

Ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε. "Arise, get up," not "awake." Mt. omits the command; Mk. gives the exact words, *Talitha cumi*. For the nom. with the art. as voc. see on x. 21, xviii. 11, 13. For ἐφώνησεν comp. ver. 8, xvi. 24.

55. ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς. There can be no doubt that the Evangelist uses the phrase of the spirit returning to a dead body, which is the accurate use of the phrase. Only the beloved physician makes this statement. In LXX it is twice used of a living man's strength reviving; of the fainting Samson (Judg. xv. 19), and of the starving Egyptian (1 Sam. xxx. 12). Note that Lk. has his favourite παραχρῆμα, where Mk. has his favourite εὐθύς; and comp. ver. 44, v. 25, xviii. 43, xxii. 60.

διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν. This care of Jesus in commanding food after the child's long exhaustion would be of special interest to Lk. In their joy and excitement the parents might have forgotten it. The charge is somewhat parallel to ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ (vii. 15) of the widow's son at Nain. In each case He intimates that nature is to resume its usual course: the old ties and the old responsibilities are to begin again.

56. παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδεὶν εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός. The command has been rejected as an unintelligible addition to the narrative. No such command was given at Nain or at Bethany. The object of it cannot have been to keep the miracle a secret. Many were outside expecting the funeral, and they would have to be told why no funeral was to take place. It can hardly have been Christ's intention in this way to prevent the multitude from making a bad use of the miracle. This command to the parents would not have attained such an object. It was given more probably for the parents' sake, to keep them from letting the effect of this great blessing evaporate in vainglorious gossip. To thank God for it at home would be far more profitable than talking about it abroad.

IX. 1-50. *To the Departure for Jerusalem.*

This is the last of the four sections into which the Ministry in Galilee (iv. 14-ix. 50) was divided. It contains the Mission of the Twelve (1-9), the Feeding of the Five Thousand (10-17), the Transfiguration (28-36), the Healing of the Demoniac Boy (37-43), and two Predictions of the Passion (18-27, 43-50).

1-9. The Mission of the Twelve and the Fears of Herod. Mt. x. 1-15; Mk. vi. 7-11. Mt. is the most full. Lk. gives no note

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY.

NINE VOLUMES NOW READY.—*See preceding pages.*

The following other Volumes are in course of preparation:—

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

- Genesis.** T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, Oxford, and Canon of Rochester.
- Exodus.** A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, University of Edinburgh.
- Leviticus.** J. F. STENNING, M.A., Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford; and the late Rev. H. A. White, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford.
- Numbers.** G. BUCHANAN GRAY, M.A., Lecturer in Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford.
- Joshua.** GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Free Church College, Glasgow.
- Kings.** FRANCIS BROWN, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Languages, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
- Isaiah.** A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, Free Church College, Edinburgh.
- Jeremiah.** A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
- Minor Prophets.** W. R. HARPER, Ph.D., President of Chicago University.
- Psalms.** C. A. BRIGGS, D.D., Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
- Job.** S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.
- Daniel.** REV. JOHN P. PETERS, Ph.D., late Professor of Hebrew, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia, now Rector of St. Michael's Church, New York City.
- Ezra and Nehemiah.** REV. L. W. BATTEN, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia.
- Chronicles.** EDWARD L. CURTIS, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

- Synopsis of the Four Gospels.** W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford; and Rev. W. C. ALLEN, M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.
- Matthew.** REV. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., Chaplain, Fellow, and Lecturer in Theology and Hebrew, Exeter College, Oxford.
- Acts.** FREDERICK H. CHASE, D.D., Christ's College, Cambridge.
- Corinthians.** ARCH. ROBERTSON, D.D., Principal of King's College, London.
- Galatians.** REV. ERNEST D. BURTON, A.B., Professor of New Testament Literature, University of Chicago.
- The Pastoral Epistles.** WALTER LOCK, D.D., Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Oxford.
- Hebrews.** T. C. EDWARDS, D.D., Principal of the Theological College, Bala; late Principal of University College of Wales, Aberystwyth.
- James.** REV. JAMES H. ROPES, A.B., Instructor in New Testament Criticism in Harvard University.
- Peter and Jude.** CHARLES BIGG, D.D., Rector of Fenny Compton, Leamington; Bampton Lecturer, 1886.
- The Johannine Epistles.** S. D. F. SALMOND, D.D., Principal, and Professor of Systematic Theology, Free Church College, Aberdeen.
- Revelation.** ROBERT H. CHARLES, D.D., Professor of Biblical Greek in the University of Dublin.

Other engagements will be announced shortly.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, & CO. LTD.

BS
1185
K4
cop.2

Kennedy, James
The note-line

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

